

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.





LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 188—82nd Congress

Chapter 533—1st Session

H. R. 4740

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                           |   |
|-------------------------------------------|---|
| Digest of Public Law 188 . . . . .        | 1 |
| Index and Summary of H. R. 4740 . . . . . | 2 |



## DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 188

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952. Includes the following items, among others:

State Department. Provides \$12,000,000 for construction of projects under the jurisdiction of the International Boundary and Water Commission, U. S. and Mexico, and \$30,000 for emergency flood protection on the Rio Grande. Provides \$25,000,000 for international information and educational activities, and includes language making funds available for "establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries.

Commerce Department. Provides \$250,000 for dissemination of technological scientific, and engineering information to business and industry. Provides funds for the Bureau of Census, including \$200,000 for censuses of business, transportation, manufactures, and mineral industries. Includes \$5,388,120 for administration of export controls. Appropriates to the Bureau of Public Roads, \$21,000,000 for forest highways, to remain available until expended; \$3,500,000 for highways in Tongass National Forest, Alaska; \$1,125,000 for highways on public lands, and \$3,000,000 for the Inter-American Highway.

General Provisions. Provides that, in general, no commitment may be made hereafter for a contribution by the U. S. in excess of 33 1/3 per centum of the budget of any international organization of which the U. S. is a member, and requires consultation with Senate and House Appropriations Committees for proposed contributions in excess of 33 1/3 percent. Prohibits commitments for contributions by the U. S. in excess of 33 1/3 of the budget of any international organization of which the U. S. is not now a member.

Limits the filling of vacancies, with specified exceptions, until the personnel of the departments and agencies involved has been reduced to 90% of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952. Limits the number of personnel workers to that number provided by a ratio of one personnel employee to every 115 employees. Restricts the employment of chauffeurs. Authorizes 2 positions at grade GS-18 and 7 at GS-17 in the FBI. Authorizes the Secretary of State to place the position of Director, Office of Budget and Finance, in grade GS-17, and the Secretary of Commerce to place the position of Director Office of Budget and Management, in grade GS-17.



## INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON H. R. 4740

|                   |                                                                                                                                                            |
|-------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| February 19, 1951 | Hearings: House, Department of Justice Appropriations for 1952                                                                                             |
| February 23, 1951 | Hearings: House, Department of State Appropriations for 1952                                                                                               |
| February 28, 1951 | Hearings: Senate, on H.R.4740. Part 1                                                                                                                      |
| April 2, 1951     | Hearings: House, Department of Commerce Appropriations for 1952                                                                                            |
| June 11, 1951     | Hearings: Senate, on H. R. 4740. Part 2                                                                                                                    |
| June 27, 1951     | Hearings: House, additional Hearings on H. R. 4740.                                                                                                        |
| July 10, 1951     | Mr. Rooney, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported H. R. 4740. Report No. 685. Print of bill as reported.                                          |
| July 17, 1951     | Rules Committee reported resolution waiving points of order on this bill.                                                                                  |
| July 23, 1951     | House began debate                                                                                                                                         |
| July 24, 1951     | Continued debate                                                                                                                                           |
| July 25, 1951     | House continued debate                                                                                                                                     |
| July 26, 1951     | House concluded debate and passed H. R. 4740 with amendments.                                                                                              |
| July 27, 1951     | H. R. 4740 referred to Senate Appropriations Committee. Print of bill as referred to Senate.                                                               |
| August 21, 1951   | Senate reported H. R. 4740 with amendments. Senate Report 697. Print of bill as reported in the Senate                                                     |
| August 22, 1951   | Made unfinished business                                                                                                                                   |
| August 23, 1951   | Senate began debate.                                                                                                                                       |
| August 24, 1951   | Senate concluded debate and passed H. R. 4740 with amendments. Print of bill as passed in the Senate with amendments numbered. Senate conferees appointed. |





September 13, 1951 House conferees appointed.

October 10, 1951 House received Conference Report. House Report  
1123

October 11, 1951 House agreed to Conference Report

October 12, 1951 Senate agreed to Conference Report

October 22, 1951 Approved: Public Law 188.









STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY  
APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1952

---

JULY 10, 1951.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State  
of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. ROONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the  
following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 4740]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in  
explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the  
Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for  
the fiscal year 1952.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTIMATES

The budget estimates forming the primary bases of consideration  
by the committee will be found in the budget for 1952 on the following  
pages:

| <i>Agency</i>               | <i>Pages</i>       |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Department of State.....    | 756-785, inclusive |
| Department of Justice.....  | 694-716, inclusive |
| Department of Commerce..... | 482-541, inclusive |
| The Judiciary.....          | 36- 44, inclusive  |

The committee also considered budget amendments contained in  
House Documents Nos. 66, 94, 100, 139, 162, and 178.

The following tabulation summarizes the amounts recommended in the bill in comparison with the corresponding budget estimates and 1951 appropriations.

| Department or agency                      | Appropriations, 1951,<br>as reduced<br>by sec. 1214 | Budget esti-<br>mates, 1952 | Recom-<br>mended in<br>bill for 1952 | Bill compared with                       |                |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|----------------|
|                                           |                                                     |                             |                                      | 1951, as re-<br>duced under<br>sec. 1214 | 1952 estimates |
| APPROPRIATIONS                            |                                                     |                             |                                      |                                          |                |
| State-----                                | \$274,469,086                                       | \$283,686,476               | \$231,432,000                        | —\$43,037,086                            | —\$52,254,476  |
| Justice-----                              | 158,222,000                                         | 184,356,000                 | 181,667,000                          | +23,445,000                              | —2,689,000     |
| Commerce-----                             | 712,652,886                                         | 763,763,925                 | 612,698,000                          | —99,954,886                              | —151,065,925   |
| The Judiciary-----                        | 25,503,665                                          | 26,489,740                  | 25,918,115                           | +414,450                                 | —571,625       |
| Total appropriations-----                 | 1,170,847,637                                       | 1,258,296,141               | 1,051,715,115                        | —119,132,522                             | —206,581,026   |
| CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS                   |                                                     |                             |                                      |                                          |                |
| Justice-----                              | 700,000                                             |                             |                                      | —700,000                                 |                |
| Commerce-----                             | 40,865,000                                          |                             |                                      | —40,865,000                              |                |
| Total contract authority-----             | 41,565,000                                          |                             |                                      | —41,565,000                              |                |
| Total cash and contract<br>authority----- | 1,212,412,637                                       | 1,258,296,141               | 1,051,715,115                        | —160,697,522                             | —206,581,026   |

#### SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The total of the regular annual appropriations carried in the bill for the three departments and the Judiciary is \$1,051,715,115. The reductions in the budget estimates total \$206,581,026. The amount recommended in the bill is \$160,697,522 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951. This reduction is especially significant in view of the numerous agencies in the bill which are performing necessary services directly related to national defense which could not be reduced. The committee has very carefully scrutinized the request of each agency with the view of eliminating all nonessential expenditures. All requests for additional automobiles have been denied and requests for replacements have been reduced substantially.

#### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The committee recognizes the fact that a strong Department of State is presently absolutely essential not only to the best interests and defense of this Nation but also to the maintenance and expansion of freedom throughout the world. The committee strongly feels that to restrict the essential activities of this Department at a time when this Nation is being unduly subjected to ever increasing pressures from the Kremlin would be a disservice to ourselves, our Allies, and freedom-loving peoples everywhere. With these thoughts in mind the committee has allowed sufficient funds for the Department to carry out its essential activities but it has also carefully guarded against allowing increases where it appears that the job can be done by improving the quality of operations rather than their volume. Reductions were made in every appropriation item included in the bill except the Philippine Rehabilitation program for which funds are provided only to liquidate prior contract authority. The \$231,432,000 allowed is a total reduction of \$52,254,476 from the budget estimate and \$43,037,086 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951.

The provision exempting the Department of State from the law prescribing the use of vessels of United States registry by any officer or employee of the United States, has been deleted.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The sum of \$75,500,000 included in the bill for this item provides the funds for personal services and other expenses for the operation of the regular Departmental service and approximately 300 Foreign Service posts throughout the world to carry out the consular and diplomatic activities of the Department. The amount recommended represents a reduction of \$1,900,000 in the budget estimate, and is \$2,992,000 below the amount of \$78,492,000, appropriated for this item for fiscal year 1951. However, the fiscal year 1951 appropriation included certain non-recurring items totalling \$3,823,133, the largest of which was \$3,615,000 for USIE administrative support to be financed under that appropriation in 1952. The amount included allows for statutory promotions but provides for no staff increase and limits the expenditures for other purposes to that of fiscal year 1951.

The committee recognizes that in certain areas in view of the current world situation some increases are warranted but assumes that under the provisions made in this bill such internal adjustments will be made without increasing the annual cost. The committee expects the Department to continue the recently initiated practice of notifying the committee of the need for significant adjustments in staff or requirements for other objects as such instances occur.

While the committee recognizes the advantage in flexibility in the assignment of department people to the field and foreign service officers to the department, it also recognizes the need for standardizing the perquisites of both categories of personnel particularly with respect to salaries and leave provisions.

It is suggested the Department give consideration to longer periods of service by the personnel at their respective posts prior to transfer to other posts. In this connection every effort must be made to combine transfer and home leave travel in order to reduce the expenses of accomplishing the two purposes.

The committee is greatly concerned with the upward trend in communication costs, and while recognizing that some efforts have been made to date to reduce the volume and cost of communications, further reductions must be realized.

With regard to the request for the preparation and printing of foreign relations volumes the committee is of the opinion that no more than the amount of funds provided in the 1951 appropriation Act for these purposes should be expended at this time.

While at least some progress has been made in assessing the degree of hardship encountered by employees at various overseas posts, the Department is cautioned that most careful scrutiny of the actual conditions at such posts should be made before granting any bonuses to employees located at these posts.

The committee has included in the bill language providing that not less than \$10,000,000 of this appropriation shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation.

## REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

The bill includes \$850,000 for representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946. This is a



reduction of \$150,000 from the request submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. This appropriation is for the purpose of reimbursing officers of the Foreign Service for expenses, incurred at their post of duty, of entertainment necessary in the conduct of official duties and purchase of flowers, wreaths, and similar tokens for presentation in accordance with local custom on appropriate occasions. This measure was designed to remove personal wealth as a prerequisite to appointment to high positions in the diplomatic service.

#### FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

The budget estimate of \$4,627,000 to be paid into the Foreign Service retirement and disability trust fund, established to provide annuities for Foreign Service officers, is presently disallowed. Since the fund had an existing balance of \$16,923,100 as of June 30, 1950, and the annual cost of annuities is approximately \$1,200,000, the deferral of the Federal contribution for 1952 will not jeopardize the solvency of this fund in the new fiscal year.

#### ACQUISITION OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

The bill includes \$8,000,000 for this purpose which is \$1,000,000 below the amount of the budget estimate and \$5,050,000 above the amount appropriated for 1951. However, when the unobligated balances available from previous years are taken into consideration, there was \$16,236,965 available for programming in 1951. The committee recommendation will make an estimated total of \$8,637,751, a reduction of \$7,599,214, available in 1952. Although this appears as a general appropriation, it is not an expense to be borne by the American taxpayer. The funds appropriated for this purpose will be returned to the United States Treasury in exchange for foreign currency credits, representing payments resulting from lend-lease and surplus property settlements abroad. The foreign credits thus obtained, and not U. S. dollars, will then be used for the acquisition of real estate, and improvements thereon, for our Foreign Service.

#### EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

This appropriation is used as an emergency fund as well as for the purpose of defraying the cost of repatriating American nationals stranded in various parts of the world. The bill includes \$9,900,000 for this item, a decrease of \$10,000,000 in the budget estimate and a decrease of \$675,000 below the appropriation for fiscal year 1951.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

This appropriation provides funds to pay the United States share of the expenses of the international organizations in which it participates pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific acts of Congress. Contributions are made to the United Nations, 6 specialized agencies, 7 inter-American organizations, 13 other international organizations, and 2 activities of a non-organizational character (Gorgas Memorial Laboratory and payment to the Government of Panama). The amount included in the bill, \$29,300,000, is a reduction of \$1,384,476

in the budget estimate and is \$24,249,297 below the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1951.

Representatives of the Department when testifying before the Committee volunteered a reduction of \$386,615 in this estimate. The committee recommends a further reduction of \$997,861 and has left to the discretion of the Department the application of this reduction.

This committee has repeatedly requested the Department to make every effort to reduce the percentage this Government is asked to pay to the various international organizations. It is disappointed in the accomplishment of the Department to date in obtaining such reductions. It was testified that during the past year the following reductions have been accomplished:

|                                |                                      |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| United Nations.....            | From 39.79 percent to 38.92 percent. |
| UNESCO.....                    | From 37.82 percent to 35.00 percent. |
| World Health Organization..... | From 35.99 percent to 35 percent.    |

However, the following increases were granted:

|                                             |                                      |
|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| International Civil Aviation Organization.. | From 18.27 percent to 24.98 percent. |
| International Labor Organization.....       | From 22 percent to 25 percent.       |

Every effort must be made to further reduce the high percentage of contributions which this country is called upon to make to all these organizations; to withdraw from organizations where there is duplication of functions or where benefits received are insufficient to warrant their continued operation; and to make certain that existing organizations are run efficiently and economically.

#### MISSIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

This appropriation provides funds to maintain permanent representation to the United Nations and seven other international organizations in which the United States participates pursuant to treaties and specific Acts of Congress. These missions are vitally necessary to insure effective participation and presentation of the United States' viewpoints within the organizations. The committee recommends \$1,400,000 for this activity, a reduction of \$170,000 below the request of the Bureau of the Budget and \$200,000 below the amount appropriated for 1951.

#### INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES

The committee has included \$2,700,000 for this item, which is a reduction of \$100,000 from both the budget request and the amount appropriated for 1951. These funds are used to finance the United States participation in international conferences, new or temporary international organizations and similar international activities for which specific appropriations have not been provided.

#### INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

The committee has allowed \$14,930,000 for this item, a reduction of \$2,520,000 from the request and an increase of \$12,700,000 over the amount appropriated for 1951. The committee action reduced by \$300,000 and \$20,000, respectively, the requests for "Salaries and ex-



penses" and "Rio Grande emergency flood protection" thus reducing the amount for these purposes to the same as that appropriated for 1951. The committee has recently received information to the effect that of the amount available in 1951 for "Construction," \$2,143,087 was unexpended as of June 30, 1951, and will thus be available in 1952. The reduction of \$2,200,000 which the committee has made in this request will not interfere with the progress of construction of Falcon Dam which accounts for over 90 percent of the construction funds.

#### AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

The amount of \$702,000, a reduction of \$288,000 in the budget estimate is recommended for this item. The reduction made by the committee is to apply entirely to the amount requested for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

The amount provided for each commission is set forth in the following table:

|                                                                              |            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| International Joint Commission, United States and Canada.....                | \$358, 620 |
| International Fisheries Commission, United States and Canada.....            | 50, 000    |
| International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission.....                       | 166, 350   |
| International Boundary Commission, United States, Alaska, and<br>Canada..... | 77, 030    |
| Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.....                                 | 50, 000    |
| Total.....                                                                   | 702, 000   |

#### INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

The bill includes \$150,000 for this Commission, a reduction of \$115,000 below the amount of the budget estimate. While no funds were included for this activity in the 1951 appropriations, there was \$240,000 appropriated in the Deficiency Act, 1950, which was to provide for expenses for a portion of 1950 and the fiscal year 1951. The committee was advised that there was a substantial unobligated balance of these funds on June 30, 1951. The Commission was established by the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, for the purpose of adjudicating the claims of American nationals against the Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia which deposited \$17,000,000 with the United States to cover payment of these claims. The Act provides that 3 percent of the claims payments may be covered into the Treasury to offset administrative expenses. The committee reiterates more forcibly than ever that it expects the Commission to carry on and complete its work within the 3 percent allowance and thus at no cost whatever to the American taxpayer.

#### INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

A total of \$85,000,000 is recommended for this program, which is a reduction of \$30,000,000 in the budget estimate. The sum of \$106,089,789 plus not to exceed \$15,212,000 in counterpart funds was appropriated for the fiscal year 1951. However, of that amount, \$50,821,939 was for capital outlay. Since none of the funds requested in the budget estimate for fiscal year 1952 are for capital outlay, the amount approved represents an increase of \$14,520,150 in operating expenses. This is the very minimum amount necessary to annualize

certain increases allowed in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, in which this committee and the Congress authorized a greatly strengthened and intensified Voice of America.

The committee again emphasizes the necessity for a strong and effective information and educational exchange program to combat the vicious lies by which the forces of communism are attempting to poison the minds of freedom loving people throughout the world. However, the budget submission placed undue emphasis on certain activities and included others, the value of which is extremely questionable.

The request under the Exchange of Persons program contained an item of \$24,875 for luncheons for 375 "leaders and specialists" visiting the United States during the fiscal year 1952. This sum was to cover the cost of 2,475 lunches for residents, including State Department personnel, as well as the 375 foreign visitors. The amount requested was based on an average cost of \$8.73 per person. The Department can and must, as far as this committee is concerned, dispense with such luxuries. In view of the Fulbright program, the Finnish program, the Iranian program, the Economic Cooperation Administration program and the Defense Department program, which provide funds for the exchange of several thousand persons annually, it is not necessary to allow any increase in funds over the amount provided in fiscal year 1951 for this activity.

The committee has allowed \$5,000, a reduction of \$30,000 in the amount of the limitation, for entertainment in the United States. This amount shall not be supplemented from any other funds appropriated to the Department.

The request for funds to add six new languages to the roster of foreign-language broadcasts is approved. However, the request for \$2,834,000 for the purchase of radio sets for free distribution is denied.

The action of the committee allows only \$1,475,000 for the salaries and expenses of the following offices: Office of director, international information; Office of director, educational exchange; Policy advisory staff; Interdepartmental foreign information staff; Office of general manager; and Public affairs regional bureau staff. These are the offices whose primary aim is over-all executive direction, evaluation and management of the International Information and Education activities. The amount allowed is \$751,552 below the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget, and is substantially below the currently budgeted rate of obligation. However, the current level has been reached only after transfers administratively made to these offices from funds appropriated for other activities. Such transfers were made contrary to budgets previously submitted to Congress and used as the basis for appropriating funds. Funds were administratively made available to these offices without prior consultation with or advice to the Appropriations Committee and even contrary to the specific instructions contained in previous Committee reports. The amount allowed is approximately equal to the amount that these offices would have had available during 1951 in the absence of the aforementioned unauthorized transfers.

The hearings disclosed that various and sundry employees of the USIE made a total of 364 speeches and talks in 29 States during the period July 1, 1949, to January 30, 1951. It is difficult to see how this program's primary purpose of getting the truth to people behind the

Iron Curtain and throughout the rest of the world is benefited by wholesale speech-making to our own people. The funds appropriated can be more effectively used. The committee will look with extreme disfavor upon any further activities of this kind at government expense by any employee of USIE below the level of Assistant Secretary.

The Department requested that the bill contain language to authorize the "purchase of space in publications abroad". The importance of advertising programs and program schedules abroad is recognized. However, the committee learned from personal observation that the Department is currently placing much advertising in foreign editions of American newspapers and periodicals printed in the English language. Such advertising is not at all necessary for the accomplishment of the program's objective, to wit: The piercing of the Iron Curtain. The bill, therefore, limits the purchase of such advertising to foreign-language publications.

It is noted that there is an apparent excessive number of employees at grades G. S. 13, 14 and 15 in relation to the total staffs with which they are connected. The Department should balance its staff requirements in terms of proper grade structure.

In approving the manner of handling administrative support costs, it is expected that such expenses in their entirety will be charged against these funds so that the total cost of this program will be directly reflected in this appropriation.

#### PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION

This program is conducted by various Federal agencies including the Bureau of Public Roads, under the provisions of Public Law 370, Seventy-ninth Congress, and is coordinated by the Department of State. The committee has allowed \$3,000,000 to liquidate contract authority granted in previous years to the Department of State for the Bureau of Public Roads.

#### TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

The total amount recommended in the bill for the Department of Justice is \$181,667,000, a reduction of \$2,689,000 from the amount of the budget estimates and an increase of \$23,445,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951. Appropriation items contained in this title include those for Legal Activities and General Administration, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Federal Prison System, and the Office of Alien Property. The major items of increase above the amount appropriated for 1951 are for the FBI, \$20,728,000; Immigration and Naturalization Service, \$2,160,000; and for General Legal Activities \$1,127,000. The major part of these increases is necessary to annualize the salaries and expenses for additional personnel authorized on a part year basis in supplemental appropriations for 1951 made for the purpose of enforcing the Internal Security Act and to assure adequate protection to this country from the threat of communistic and other subversive activities.

The action of the committee with respect to each of the appropriation items for the Department of Justice is explained herewith.



## LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

*Salaries and expenses, general administration.*—This appropriation provides funds for the salaries and expenses of the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, Pardon Attorney, Board of Immigration Appeals, Board of Parole, Administrative Division, and the examination of judicial offices. The committee has allowed \$2,250,000 which is a reduction of \$113,000 from the amount of the budget estimates and an increase of \$75,000 over the amount available in 1951.

The increase will provide approximately \$45,000 for within-grade salary advancements and pay in excess of the 52-week base and \$30,000 for the most urgent of the new positions requested for the Deputy Attorney General, the Board of Parole, and the Administrative Division. However, these funds are not to be used to fill the budgeted position of "management analyst."

*Salaries and expenses, general legal activities.*—This appropriation item provides funds for the salaries and expenses for the following: Office of the Solicitor General, Tax Division, Criminal Division, Claims Division, Customs Division, Lands Division, and Legal Counsel Division. The bill includes \$9,032,000 for these purposes, a reduction of \$300,000 from the request of the Bureau of the Budget and an increase of \$1,127,000 over the amount appropriated for 1951. The increase is primarily to provide funds for the Criminal Division and the Lands Division. The increase for the Criminal Division is to annualize the salaries and expenses for which provision was made on a part-year basis in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951. That act included \$400,000 to cover the expense of discharging this Division's additional responsibilities under the Internal Security Act. The increase for the Lands Division is primarily to cover this Division's greatly expanded work in connection with the acquisition of land for the Department of Defense. The committee recognizes that there is need for certain additional positions in the Office of the Solicitor General, the Lands Division, the Tax Division, and the Customs Division. The amount provided in the bill is not sufficient to cover all the new positions requested but will permit modest increases in personnel.

No funds are included for the new positions requested for the Claims Division. If properly organized and operated, this division can adequately discharge its responsibilities with a smaller staff. The committee was quite dissatisfied with the information submitted in the written justifications and the oral testimony concerning the Claims Division with the result that an investigation was ordered to determine the actual situation with regard to the alleged backlog of work and the reasons therefor. This investigation revealed that, in one section, where it had been reported that there was a backlog of 5,321 cases there was actually only 1,418. It was shown that records were kept in a haphazard manner, were incomplete in some instances and duplicating in others; that there was reluctance to delegate authority to United States attorneys; that there was lack of effective administrative control over the work; and that personnel was distributed with insufficient regard for the volume and importance of the work in the various sections. The committee has already urged the Department to take such steps as may be necessary to

correct the deficiencies in this Division which has not compared in efficiency with the other divisions of the Department of Justice.

*Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division.*—The committee approved \$3,200,000 for this division, a reduction of \$550,000 below the amount appropriated for 1951 and \$500,000 below the amount of the budget estimate.

*Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals.*—The bill includes \$12,990,000 for this item, a decrease of \$40,000 from the amount of the budget request and an increase of \$243,000 over the amount which was available for 1951. The increase will provide \$198,175 estimated to be necessary to cover the cost of within-grade promotions and pay in excess of the 52-week base and will provide \$44,825 for the most urgent of other needs. The committee has no objection to the reallocation of field deputy U. S. Marshals to grade G. S. 6 within the limit of available funds.

*Fees and expenses of witnesses.*—The Bureau of the Budget requested an increase of \$500,000 for this item over the amount available in 1951 fiscal year. There is little tangible information upon which to base estimates of the future costs for fees and expenses of witnesses, other than past requirements which the committee feels represent the most realistic base. The committee therefore reduced the budget estimate to \$1,000,000, the same amount as appropriated in the 1951 fiscal year.

*Salaries and expenses, Claims of persons of Japanese ancestry.*—The committee has approved \$725,000 for this activity, a reduction of \$25,000 from the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget. It has allowed the full amount requested, \$500,000, for payment of claims. The reduction of \$25,000, applied against the administrative expenses of adjudicating claims, leaves \$225,000 for this purpose.

An investigation requested by the committee revealed certain deficiencies in the administration of this program such as failure to devise proper forms for the filing of claims; failure to publish and distribute to claimants a statement of the type of proof as to ownership, value, and disposition required; failure to timely advise Congress of the need for remedial legislation; and improper assignment of personnel to the program. Correction of such deficiencies will permit the expeditious adjudication of these claims.

#### FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The committee recommends \$90,000,000, a reduction of \$665,000 in the amount of the budget estimate, and an increase of \$20,728,000 over the appropriation for fiscal year 1951 for this Bureau. The reduction is based on the premise that new positions authorized will not be filled as rapidly as was originally anticipated. Although the committee has made substantial decreases in many other items in the bill, and has turned down many requests for additional personnel, it does not feel that similar action can be taken at this time with this Bureau. The Federal Bureau of Investigation by statute and Executive order is vested with highly important functions bearing upon the protection of the Nation against threats within its own borders. Director Hoover advised the committee that since the cessation of hostilities incident to World War II there has been an increase of 380 percent in the internal security matters referred to the Bureau for investigation. As of July,

1950 there were 12,882 security matters pending for investigation, while as of February 15, 1951 there were 28,441 of such matters, an increase of over 120 percent. Conditions at home and abroad dictate that security matters be afforded top priority. It is felt that the funds approved by the committee are in accord with the Bureau's need for discharging its many official responsibilities and confidential investigation commitments in the security field; to reduce the existing backlog; to maintain the internal security of the home front; and to insure adequate and effective security investigative coverage and control in respect to clandestine activities of those individuals, organizations and groups designed to subvert our Nation.

#### IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

The bill includes \$36,500,000 for this important service, a reduction of \$200,000 in the budget estimate and an increase of \$2,160,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951.

It is believed that some savings can be effected in the amount requested for alien registration. The request was based on 4,000,000 aliens registering, whereas the testimony revealed that only 2.3 million were registered by February 1951. The increase allowed is primarily to continue on a full year basis the enforcement program scheduled to implement the Internal Security Act of 1950 for which \$3,000,000 was originally allowed in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, approved January 6, 1951.

In addition to the new responsibilities placed upon this vital agency as a result of the Internal Security Act, its regular work has increased considerably. Commissioner Maekey testified that during fiscal year 1950 there were approximately 90,000,000 entries at ports of entry into the United States, an increase of nearly 2½ million over 1949. In 1950 a peak of 579,105 aliens were expelled from the United States which was almost double the previous year. In fiscal year 1950 the Border Patrol patrolled more than 10,000,000 miles, examined more than 2,000,000 conveyances, and questioned more than 7,000,000 persons. Apprehensions totalled 469,581. Applications for certificates of arrival and preliminary forms for declaration of intention were received from 117,435 aliens, an increase of 36 percent over the 86,416 received during 1949.

#### FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

The total amount recommended herein for the Federal Prison System is \$25,970,000, a reduction of \$346,000 from the budget request and a decrease of \$373,000 from the amount appropriated for 1951.

The cost of the activities of the prison system is defrayed out of three appropriations: "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons", "Buildings and Facilities", and "Support of United States Prisoners". For salaries and expenses the committee considered the original budget estimate of \$22,966,000 plus \$775,000 contained in House Document No. 94, making a total request of \$23,741,000. Of this amount the committee allowed \$23,500,000, a reduction of \$241,000. The amount recommended includes the full amount of \$775,000 requested "to enable the Bureau of Prisons to be in readiness to assume its responsi-



bilities, as delegated by the Attorney General, under the aforementioned Act (Internal Security Act of 1950) in the event the President should proclaim the existence of such an emergency". The remainder of the recommended increase will provide for statutory salary costs of \$235,000 and \$311,000 for increased population and estimated increased cost of food, clothing, and other necessary non-personal services expenditures. This represents an increase of slightly less than 5 percent for non-personal services expenditures.

For "Buildings and Facilities" the committee has approved \$470,000, a decrease of \$5,000 from the request and \$1,680,000 less than the amount available for 1951. Of the amount included in the bill \$360,000 is to liquidate prior contract authority.

For "Support of United States Prisoners" the committee has included \$2,000,000 a reduction of \$100,000 from the amount requested. These funds are required to pay State and local penal institutions for short term boarding of Federal prisoners and for the maintenance of seven jails in the Territory of Alaska.

#### OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

This office exercises the functions of the Attorney General under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended. In accordance with that Act, the Office of Alien Property requests authorizations of Congress to use assets vested in the Attorney General to defray all expenses incurred in carrying out the provisions of the Act. The committee recommends an authorization of \$3,600,000, which is \$500,000 less than the amount requested and \$550,000 less than the authorization for 1951. While the budget estimate was in the amount of \$4,100,000, the committee found that \$77,068 for rents and utilities had inadvertently been deducted and added to the budget request for the General Services Administration. Since these costs must actually be paid from this fund, the effective reduction is \$77,068 greater than indicated above.

The budget estimate of this item included \$520,305 for vesting certain enemy owned property. However, there was testimony that all such vesting would be completed before June 30, 1951 with the exception of possible newly discovered matters. In view of this, the funds allowed should be sufficient to carry on this activity during the current fiscal year.

#### TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The budget estimates for this Department, exclusive of Maritime activities for which appropriations for fiscal year 1952 were contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill, total \$763,763,925. The appropriations for fiscal year 1951, as reduced under Sec. 1214 amounted to \$712,652,886 plus contract authority of \$40,865,000, for a total of \$753,517,886. The bill appropriates \$612,698,000, a reduction of \$151,065,925 below budget estimates and a decrease of \$140,819,886 below the amount of cash and contract authority granted for fiscal year 1951.

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

*Salaries and expenses.*—The committee recommends \$1,500,000 for this item, a decrease of \$136,000 in the budget estimate. While this amount appears as an increase of \$150,000 over the amount appropriated for this item for fiscal year 1951, it is actually a reduction of \$136,515 in the 1952 base when the comparative transfers from Departmental salaries and expenses, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and transfers pursuant to Reorganization Plans 5 and 21 are taken into consideration. Retrenchment below the current level in other divisions will be necessary in order to provide the Office of Transportation with a staff to accelerate and make more effective the coordination of the Department's internal transportation programs and the development of a consistent overall transportation policy.

*Technical and scientific services.*—An appropriation of \$250,000 is recommended for this activity. This represents a reduction of \$50,000 below the budget estimate and is \$25,000 over the amount available for the current fiscal year. The increase granted will provide for mandatory within-grade promotions, and a strengthening of those activities of this service which are most important to our national defense.

## BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

*Salaries and expenses.*—This item reflects the consolidation of the appropriations "Age and Citizenship Certification," "Current Census Statistics", and "General Administration". The amount appropriated for these three items for fiscal year 1951 totalled \$7,007,000. The amount recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1952 is \$7,100,000, a reduction of \$70,000 in the budget estimate. The increase of \$93,000 allowed is to provide for mandatory within-grade promotions, salaries for one additional work day, and the increased workload in foreign trade and shipping statistics.

*Seventeenth decennial census.*—The bill includes \$7,000,000 for this activity, a reduction of \$1,800,000 in the amount of the budget estimate. The testimony of the Bureau of the Census indicated that of the \$8,800,000 requested there would remain \$1,711,968 unobligated at the end of fiscal year 1952. Accordingly, that amount has been reduced from the amount requested. A further reduction of \$88,032 was made inasmuch as the committee was advised that the UNIVAC machine, an electronic computer which would revolutionize the Bureau's normal tabulating procedures, has been completed and undergone its first series of acceptance tests satisfactorily.

*Census of Governments.*—P. L. 767, Eighty-first Congress, authorized the Secretary of Commerce to take, compile, and publish for the year 1952 and for every fifth year thereafter a census of governments, to include but not to be limited to data on taxes and tax valuation, governmental receipts, expenditures, indebtedness, and employees of States, counties, cities, and other governmental units in the United States and in such of its territories and possessions as may be determined by the Secretary. In view of present world conditions and the amount of expenditures necessary for defense purposes, the committee is of the opinion that there are many more urgent undertakings at this time and has therefore denied the budget estimate of \$2,250,000 for this purpose.

*Censuses of business, transportation, manufactures and mineral industries.*—The bill includes \$200,000, a reduction of \$100,000 in the budget estimate, to provide for the initial planning and preparatory work for the 1953 censuses of business, transportation, manufactures, and mineral industries, which because of their extensive use in dealing with the problems of industrial mobilization, are considered by the Census Bureau to be among the most important ever taken.

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

The total recommended by the committee for the Civil Aeronautics Administration is \$159,623,000. This is a reduction of \$40,060,000 from the amount of the budget estimates.

The committee reiterates once again that it is strongly of the opinion that the government should be reimbursed by the commercial air lines for many of the services presently rendered without charge by this agency. The federal government cannot continue indefinitely building and operating more and more facilities for use by the commercial airlines without receiving any reimbursement therefor.

*Salaries and expenses.*—The sum of \$99,100,000, a reduction of \$3,700,000 in the amount of the budget estimate, is approved for this item. The amount recommended is \$600,000 over the sum appropriated for fiscal year 1951. The committee recognizes the important role of this agency in national defense and in promoting and safeguarding safety in air travel. Were it not for these factors a greater reduction would have been recommended. The committee feels that the necessary programs of the Administration can be carried on within the funds allowed without impairing in any way safety in aviation. No part of the reduction shall cause any relaxation in maximum safety standards.

Over 75 percent of this appropriation is required for the operation of federal airways which include such facilities as airport traffic control towers, aeronautical communication stations, air route traffic control centers, radio ranges, instrument landing systems, airport surveillance radar, and precision approach and surveillance radar.

The committee was advised that economies as previously recommended by the committee had been effectuated. The amount allowed will require that a continuing evaluation be made of the various facilities operated in the Federal airway system and that those which are outmoded and least effective be eliminated.

*Establishment of air-navigation facilities.*—The bill includes \$20,000,000 for this program of which \$12,000,000 is for liquidation of prior contract authority. The amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951 was \$27,500,000 of which \$22,000,000 was for liquidation of prior year contract authority. The amount recommended by the committee is \$17,150,000 below the budget estimate and \$21,000,000 below the total amount appropriated in cash and contract authority for fiscal year 1951.

*Technical development and evaluation.*—The bill includes \$1,200,000 for this item which provides for the maintenance of a laboratory for developing, servicing, testing, and evaluating aeronautical devices and instruments. The amount allowed is a reduction of \$175,000 below the budget estimate.



*Washington National Airport.*—The committee recommends \$1,300,000 for "Maintenance and operation". This is the same amount provided in fiscal year 1951, but is a reduction of \$50,000 in the budget estimate. The sum of \$75,000 is included in the bill for "Construction", for sealing runways and taxiways. The committee was advised that the actual cash revenues received in fiscal year 1950 from operations at the airport amounted to \$1,092,407 while the present estimate of revenues for fiscal year 1952 is \$1,393,850.

*Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act.*—The budget estimate for this program in fiscal year 1952 is \$54,000,000. The committee has allowed \$35,840,000, a reduction of \$18,160,000. The bill includes \$15,000,000 for liquidation of prior contract authority, a reduction of \$15,000,000 in the amount requested for that purpose; \$17,000,000 for projects in the States in accordance with section 6 of the Federal Airport Act of 1946 as amended, a reduction of \$3,000,000 in the amount requested; \$1,000,000 for projects in Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Territory of Hawaii, and Territory of Alaska; and \$2,840,000 for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses, a reduction of \$160,000 in the amount requested for that purpose.

An investigation made by the committee's investigative staff disclosed that some of the buildings constructed on airfields under this program were apparently constructed as promotional efforts and thus far the efforts have not succeeded. Some administration buildings built on airfields in Louisiana were not being used for their intended purpose. The committee demands that hereafter more careful consideration be given to the need for every project before Federal funds are expended therefor.

*Alaska airports, maintenance and operation.*—The amount \$225,000 is recommended for the maintenance and operation of the public airports at Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska. This is \$225,000 below the budget estimate. The committee was informed that at the Fairbanks airport the landing and lighting areas are completed except for the installation of a rotary beacon. With regard to the Anchorage airport it is expected to be available for only limited use about the first of September, and the present small airport will probably be used for another year.

*Air-navigation development.*—The bill includes \$1,883,000, the amount of the budget estimate as revised by House Document No. 100, and also includes language which continues available the unexpended balance of the appropriation for fiscal year 1951. \$1,883,000, is to liquidate prior contract authorization. The appropriation for fiscal year 1951 was \$5,551,000 plus \$2,250,000 in contract authority. The unexpended balance, estimated at \$1,590,000, which it is recommended be continued available, is to be used on those projects already well advanced and of direct interest to the military services. The requested administrative expense limitation of \$100,000 has been reduced to \$80,000.

*Transport aircraft development.*—The budget estimate of \$600,000 contained in House Document No. 178 for expenses relating to the development of improved transport aircraft is denied. It was testified that this testing would contribute very little to national defense, but would be primarily for the benefit of the commercial



air lines. This type of aircraft development should be carried on and financed by the plane manufacturers and the commercial airlines rather than the federal government.

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The committee recommends \$3,550,000 for this agency in fiscal year 1952. This is a reduction of \$350,000 in the amount of the budget estimate. The increase of \$50,000 allowed over fiscal year 1951 is to provide for such mandatory items as within-grade salary advancements.

It will be recalled that a year ago this committee and the Congress saw fit to decrease the request of this Board from \$4,323,000 to \$3,500,000, a reduction in funds to the extent of \$823,000. At that time the committee and the Congress were severely criticized and were accused of ruining and gutting the CAB. However, on March 19 of this year, the then Chairman of the CAB advised the committee as follows:

Mr. ROONEY. How is the Board functioning?

Mr. RENTZEL. That is a matter of opinion, I imagine, but I think it is running pretty good.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it functioning a bit more smoothly than it was?

Mr. RENTZEL. We think so. We have just completed our reorganization over there and the principal objectives, a month ago, to be exact, the principal objective was to streamline the organization of the Board and give it some central direction to establish some policies and to eliminate the duplication, and we are hopeful that we have met the criticisms that have been aimed at the Board by this committee and others and we feel that we are getting a job done. We are getting rid of some of the backlog.

Mr. ROONEY. How is that alleged imposing backlog coming along?

Mr. RENTZEL. We admit some of it was paper backlog. We are trying to get rid of those. A lot of those cases are cases which were filed for defensive reasons.

Mr. ROONEY. You are not trying to flatter the committee, are you, Mr. Rentzel, by pointing out that a lot of the backlog was paper backlog? We were the first to suspect that.

Mr. RENTZEL. I am aware of your criticisms and I might say that we took the committee report last year and attempted to meet each one of them that we could.

It is recommended that legislation be enacted to separate air-line subsidies from compensation for the cost of carrying air mail. The subsidy portion, if any, should be paid through a separate appropriation rather than as presently handled through the appropriation for the Post Office Department.

#### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

There is included in the bill a total of \$12,375,000 for this activity, which is an increase of \$340,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951, and a decrease of \$400,000 in the budget estimate. Prior to this year appropriations for the Coast and Geodetic Survey were contained in three separate items: "Salaries and expenses, departmental", "Salaries and expenses, field", and "Pay, commissioned officers". The increase allowed is necessary to pay recent salary increases of wage-board employees, increased daily ration allowances, and increased costs and amounts of chart paper.

The committee was advised that the 1952 estimate was prepared after frequent consultations with the Armed Services and that the program is related to national defense and has the full support of the

several departments in the Department of Defense.

The committee recommends the language submitted in House Document No. 100 which provides reimbursement to this appropriation for charts published by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and furnished for the official use of the military departments of the Department of Defense.

#### BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

*Departmental salaries and expenses.*—The committee recommends \$3,000,000 for this item, which is a reduction of \$339,000 in the budget estimates and is \$2,150,000 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951. The funds recommended herein are for administration, analysis of economic trends, and promotion of industry and trade. Some of the activities previously carried on with funds from this item are now financed with NPA funds.

*Field office service.*—There is included in the bill \$1,900,000 for this item, which is a reduction of \$230,000 below the budget estimate and \$255,000 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951. The committee questions the advisability of continuing the operation of some of the field offices presently maintained. It will be recalled that the Committee on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommended the closing of certain of these offices.

*Export control.*—The bill contains \$5,500,000 for this item to permit the Department to regulate exports as authorized by the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended. This is a reduction of \$400,000 in the amount of the budget estimate as contained in House Document No. 139. Of the amount allowed \$1,277,000 is for transfer to the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, for enforcement of the export control program. International developments have resulted in the extension of export controls to many additional commodities due both to security and to short supply. This action has resulted in an accelerated intake in license applications, as well as in an increased need for the strengthening of enforcement procedures. Secretary Sawyer personally assured the committee that if the Department's estimates are not borne out or if the need for controls lessens, he would drop controls and cut the staff accordingly.

#### PATENT OFFICE

The sum of \$11,500,000, the same amount provided for fiscal year 1951, is recommended for this office. This is a reduction of \$100,000 in the budget estimate.

The committee was informed that during 1950 this office had shown an increase of 18 percent in total patent application disposals (80,141 compared with 67,935 for 1949) and an increase of 27 percent in the number of patents issued (38,683 as compared with 30,564 for 1949). Fees established by or pursuant to law for filing of applications, issuance of patents, sale of patent and trade-mark copies, and other services furnished by the Office produced \$5,448,000 in revenue during 1950 and were estimated by Patent Office officials to produce \$5,800,000 in 1951 and \$6,000,000 in 1952. All income received by the Patent Office is covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

## BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

*Federal-aid highways.*—The budget estimate for this item was in the amount \$420,000,000. The committee has allowed \$325,000,000, a reduction of \$95,000,000 in such estimate, on the basis that payments to the States will not be required at the rate presently estimated. It is believed that shortages of materials will reduce the amount of road work to be completed and for which funds will be required. This action of the committee will in no way retard the road program, inasmuch as substantive legislation gives the Bureau authority to incur obligations and if the work proceeds and is completed, the Federal Government is obliged to furnish the funds.

Grants are made to the States from this fund for the improvement of highways on Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban highway systems. Annual post-war authorizations have been provided in the various Federal-aid highway acts. The act of 1950, carried authorizations of \$500,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1952 and 1953. During 1950 a total of 19,669 miles and 3,007 bridges on the three systems were completed at a total cost of \$815,374,114. Of this amount \$415,375,183 was contributed by the Federal Government. The committee expects that the 1952 program of new projects will be restricted to those contributing to the national defense and meeting essential civilian requirements.

The Federal-aid Highway Act of 1950 authorizes the deduction of 3¼ percent from Federal-aid authorizations to meet the expenses of administration, engineering, and research.

*Elimination of grade crossings.*—The bill includes \$3,000,000 to reimburse the States for elimination of hazards at railroad-highway crossings under authorizations made prior to the war. The amount allowed by the committee, a reduction of \$2,211,925 in the budget estimate, is based on the premise that present conditions will in all probability delay the completion of some of this work.

Language recommended by the Bureau is included in the bill rescinding \$188,075 of the amounts previously authorized for the elimination of grade crossings and apportioned to Hawaii. The committee was informed that the Territory of Hawaii has advised the Bureau that they have no need for this amount.

*Forest highways.*—The bill includes the amount, \$21,000,000 for this item, a reduction of \$4,000,000 in the budget estimate. The operation of the forest highway program is similar to the Federal-aid programs except that the forest highway program is a Federal construction program. During 1950 a total of 541 miles was completed at a cost of \$20,181,365.

*Tongass Forest Highways, Alaska.*—The full amount of the budget estimate of \$3,500,000 is included in the bill for this program, which provides for the improvement of forest highways in the Tongass National Forest area in Alaska to meet the needs of new industries, particularly plants for wood-pulp production. A similar amount was approved in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

*War and emergency damage, Territory of Hawaii.*—The budget estimate, \$2,000,000, is provided to liquidate contract authority of like amount authorized in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for



1948. This program provided for the rehabilitation or repair of war-damaged highways and bridges in Hawaii and for the restoration of roads and bridges damaged by tidal waves in April 1946. A total of \$10,000,000 has been authorized. \$8,000,000 was appropriated in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947. The amount allowed herein will complete the program previously authorized.

*Inter-American Highway.*—The bill includes \$4,000,000, the budget estimate, for necessary expenses of continuing the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway, which is important to hemisphere defense. This work is carried on in cooperation with Central American countries. A like sum was appropriated in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

*Access roads (Act of September 7, 1950).*—The bill includes \$1,000,000 for this item, a reduction of \$2,000,000 in the budget estimate as contained in House Document No. 139.

#### NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Appropriations for this Bureau are contained in five items. The total recommended is \$13,700,000, a reduction of \$474,000 in the amount of the budget estimates. While the overall amount is \$3,230,000 above that appropriated for fiscal year 1951, this is due to the fact that \$3,800,000 is allowed for liquidation of prior contract authority for the construction of laboratories, and \$2,000,000 is allowed for the working capital fund. The committee was advised that this additional amount in the working capital fund has been made necessary by the greatly expanded program of research and development performed, primarily for the Department of Defense, on a reimbursable basis. The working capital fund was originally established with a total of \$3,000,000 on the basis of a Bureau program of approximately \$22,000,000. However, during fiscal year 1951 obligations financed through the fund are expected to total \$39,000,000 and the amount for 1952 is estimated at \$57,000,000. For "Operation and administration," the amount recommended is \$109,000 below the budget estimate and \$170,000 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951. For "Research and testing" the amount allowed is \$150,000 below the budget estimate and \$300,000 below the fiscal year 1951 appropriation. For "Radio propagation and standards" the amount allowed is \$100,000 below the budget estimate and \$200,000 below the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951.

This committee was greatly concerned last year when it was proposed to turn over the Naval Hospital at Corona, California, to the National Bureau of Standards for a guided missiles laboratory. Lengthy hearings were held in regard thereto. Despite testimony to the contrary the committee took the position that it might be necessary to reactivate this hospital and only upon assurance from the Navy and National Bureau of Standards officials that the presence of a guided missile laboratory on the premises would not interfere with the operation of the remaining portion of the hospital, did the committee agree to allowing a portion of the area (determined by the Secretary of the Navy) to be used by the National Bureau of Standards. The committee is now informed that the Navy is reactivating this hospital.



## WEATHER BUREAU

The original budget estimate for this bureau was \$26,620,000. This was amended by House Document No. 100 to \$27,095,000 so as to provide \$475,000 for the Weather Bureau's share of the operation of two additional weather stations in the Pacific Ocean, to be undertaken by the Coast Guard by July 1, 1951. The committee was advised that the additional stations are required to provide improved weather coverage in support of increased civil and military aviation in the Pacific.

The committee has allowed \$26,000,000 for the operation of the Weather Bureau, a reduction of \$1,095,000 in the budget estimate, as amended. While the committee is not specifying to what particular items the reduction is to be applied, it wishes it clearly understood that national defense items are to be given first priority in allotting available funds.

## TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

Appropriations under this title provide for the expenses of operating all of the Federal Courts including the salaries and expenses of judges and other necessary employees, salaries and expenses of bankruptcy referees, the cost of the probation system, and repair and upkeep of Federal Court buildings and grounds. The total amount of \$25,918,115 recommended to be appropriated under this title is a reduction of \$571,625 from the amount of the budget estimates and is \$414,450 above the amount appropriated for the 1951 fiscal year. The only significant new items or expansion of the judicial system provided for by this increase is one additional judgeship for the first Circuit in Hawaii, one for the new District Court of Guam and two for the northern district of Illinois.

The committee was advised that the disposition of criminal cases in the Federal Courts continues to be expeditious. 36,109 criminal cases were disposed of in 1950 compared with 36,383 filed, leaving pending 8,181 cases. When allowance is made for cases pending in which the defendants are fugitives or are serving sentences on other charges, it is estimated that the backlog of criminal cases represents approximately two months work for the courts. With reference to civil cases the condition is somewhat different. There were 53,259 cases disposed of in 1950, an increase of nearly 5,000 over 1949. The number of civil cases disposed of was 1,363 less than the number begun during 1950 with the result that the backlog of civil cases was increased to 55,603 at the end of the year.

The action of the committee with respect to the major items of appropriations is as follows:

*Supreme Court of the United States.*—The appropriation for the Supreme Court is made up of four sub-items, namely: "Salaries", "Printing and binding Supreme Court reports", "Miscellaneous expenses", and "Care of the building and grounds". The full amount of the budget request of \$1,238,250 for these items has been allowed. This is an increase of \$20,750 over the amount appropriated for 1951. The increase will provide funds for an additional law clerk for Mr. Justice Douglas, who was the only Justice of the Court having only one law clerk; and \$15,140 for increases in costs which are beyond administrative control.

*Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.*—The committee has approved the budget request of \$194,500, an increase of \$2,300 over the amount appropriated for 1951. The increase will provide for the cost of within-grade salary advancements.

*Customs Court.*—The amount, \$433,165, an increase of \$15,700 over the 1951 appropriation and a reduction of \$5,300 in the amount of the budget estimate, is recommended. Four additional clerical and stenographic employees were requested in the budget request. The increase provided will allow the addition of two of these positions and will provide for statutory in-grade salary advancements.

*Court of Claims.*—The bill includes \$579,800 for salaries and expenses which is a reduction of \$10,200 from the budget estimate and \$4,800 above the amount appropriated for 1951. This amount will provide for statutory increases in salary costs but does not allow the increase of 1.9 man years of employment upon which the budget estimate was based.

The Committee recommends \$9,100 for "Repairs and improvements", a reduction of \$150,000 in the budget estimate and a decrease of \$1,600 under the appropriation for 1951. The budget included \$150,000 for structural alterations, additions and other improvements to the Court of Claims building, for which funds have previously been requested and disallowed. Testimony by the Court officials was to the effect that they would have no objection if the committee did not grant the requested \$150,000 at this time.

*Salaries, Justices and Judges, Territory of Hawaii.*—\$120,000 has been allowed for this item which is \$4,500 below the budget estimate and \$13,500 above the amount available in 1951. The amount allowed is sufficient to cover statutory salary costs and will provide for the salary of one additional judge for a portion of the year. Testimony before the committee was to the effect that the additional authorized Judge has not yet been appointed. The reduction of \$4,500 represents the saving estimated to result from this delay in appointment.

*Salaries of Judges.*—The bill includes \$5,120,000 for this item, a reduction of \$18,125 below the budget request and \$25,000 above the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1951. An increase of \$43,125 was requested to pay the salaries of two new District Judges at \$15,000 per annum each for the Northern District of Illinois and the salary of one new Judge for the District of Guam as authorized by Public Law 691 and Public Law 630, 81st Congress. Since there are existing vacancies it is felt that the amount recommended is sufficient.

*Salaries of Clerks of Courts.*—The amount \$4,520,000, an increase of \$50,000 over the appropriation for 1951, and a reduction of \$94,000 in the budget estimate is recommended. The funds requested for reclassification of positions have not been allowed. Examination of the hearings will disclose that U. S. District Court clerks offices are maintained at several locations at which a total of less than fifty cases (civil and criminal combined but excluding bankruptcy and naturalization) were commenced during the fiscal year 1950. It is felt that the locations of these offices should be carefully examined and that all unnecessary offices should be eliminated.

*Probation system.*—The amount of \$2,180,000 is approved for salaries of probation officers and their clerical assistants. This is a decrease of \$18,700 below the amount requested and an increase of



\$35,000 over the amount available in 1951. The only increase requested was to cover statutory salary costs. However, the budget was based on an average lapse of only seven man years, whereas the lapse in 1950 was eleven man years. It is believed that savings due to lapses will absorb the reduction recommended.

*Salaries of Criers.*—The budget estimate of \$542,300 is approved for the salaries of criers. This is an increase of \$22,300 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951 and is to provide for the cost of within grade promotions, the additional cost of regular pay in excess of the 52 week base, and will provide for three new criers to serve the additional judges authorized by recent acts of Congress.

*Fees of Commissioners.*—The bill includes \$543,000 for this item which is the same as the amount requested, and \$68,000 above the amount available in 1951. The committee's recommendation is based on the moderate but steady increase in the amount of fees earned by commissioners during the last two fiscal years and indications that this trend will continue during the fiscal year 1952.

*Fees of Jurors.*—The amount of \$2,800,000, a reduction of \$100,000 from both the request and the amount available in 1951, is recommended for this item.

*Miscellaneous salaries.*—\$2,670,000 has been allowed for this item which is an increase of \$70,000 over the appropriation for 1951 and a reduction from the request of \$12,700. The increase will provide \$56,650 for statutory salary increases in 1952. It is recognized that some additional clerical and stenographic assistance will be needed by the additional judges recently authorized. The two additional positions for the Register of Wills are approved.

*Miscellaneous expenses.*—The amount \$750,000 is included in the bill for this item. This is a reduction of \$45,800 from the request and an increase of \$75,000 over the amount appropriated for 1951. However, the committee received a request for a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1951 for this item in the amount of \$56,300. While this request was received too late to be appropriated for 1951, the committee was advised that the items of expense such as increased costs for telephone rentals and legal materials and the cost of transporting household goods and effects for the personnel of the newly created District Court of Guam, could be absorbed in 1951 by deferring until 1952 certain other necessary expenditures. Thus, the effective increase recommended for 1952 is actually only \$18,700. Since the costs of many of the purchases made under this item have increased the amount allowed will permit little or no expansion of such purchases above the current level.

*Travel expenses.*—The committee has allowed \$715,000 for this item which is a reduction of \$10,000 from both the 1952 request and the amount appropriated for 1951.

*Salaries of court reporters.*—The bill includes \$988,200 for this item which is the amount of the budget request and \$16,200 above the amount available in 1951.

*Administrative Office, salaries and expenses.*—The committee has approved the amount of \$535,000 for this item which is \$15,000 above the appropriation for 1951 and a decrease of \$2,900 from the amount requested. The amount allowed will provide for statutory increases in personal services costs and an increase of approximately \$3,000 for other objects of expenditure.

*Repairs and improvements, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.*—The committee has approved \$7,100 for this item which is the same as the amount appropriated for 1951 and \$8,500 below the amount requested. \$8,500 was requested to cover the cost of painting the corridors and rooms of the District Court Building. Since it was testified that the new District Court Building would be ready for occupancy by March 1952 and perhaps as early as January 1952, the committee has disallowed the item for painting the old building.

*Salaries of referees.*—The budget estimate of \$879,000 is recommended for this item. This is the same amount as was appropriated for the 1951 fiscal year.

*Expenses of referees.*—The committee recommends \$1,090,000 for this item which is a decrease of \$90,900 from the budget request and an increase of \$95,000 above the amount appropriated for 1951. The major part of the increase requested was to cover the salaries of 35 additional clerical positions, and for an increase of \$30,000 for part time employment. While the committee feels that the request was over-ambitious it also recognizes that some increase in personnel is necessary in view of the rather large backlog of pending cases.

TITLE V—GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

The committee recommends the amount of the budget estimate, \$327,000, for the administrative expenses limitation which is the same amount as allowed for 1951. The committee has also allowed the amount of the request, \$404,000 for vocational expenses. The latter allowance is \$16,000 above the amount of the 1951 limitation. It is estimated that vocational training will be provided for 9,500 inmates in 1952 as compared with 9,300 in 1951 and 9,256 in 1950.

The following table summarizes the activities under the Corporation for 1950 and estimated for 1951 and 1952:

|                                                                  | 1950 actual    | 1951 estimate  | 1952 estimate  |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Sales to Government agencies.....                                | \$16, 234, 337 | \$18, 000, 000 | \$18, 500, 000 |
| Net earnings.....                                                | \$1, 860, 920  | \$2, 105, 500  | \$2, 110, 274  |
| Dividends paid into Treasury.....                                | \$400, 000     | \$2, 500, 000  | \$2, 147, 774  |
| Number of inmates employed full time.....                        | 3, 381         | 3, 450         | 3, 500         |
| Number of inmates for whom vocational training was provided..... | 9, 256         | 9, 300         | 9, 500         |

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 4 in connection with the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses" Department of State:

*Provided, That not less than \$10,000,000 of this appropriation shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation:*

On page 14 in connection with the appropriation for "International Information and Educational Activities" Department of State:

*purchase of space in foreign language publications abroad, without regard to the provisions of law set forth in 44 U. S. C. 322;*



On page 15 in connection with the appropriation for "International Information and Educational Activities" Department of State:

*Provided, That not to exceed \$50,000 may be used for representation abroad:*

On page 16 in connection with the appropriation for "Philippine Rehabilitation" Department of State:

*for expenses of liquidation of activities in the Philippines carried out pursuant to section 302 (a) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1782, 1791 (e)),*

On page 18 in connection with "General Provisions" Department of State:

*SEC. 107. During the current fiscal year and when purchases are made with foreign currencies, the Department of State is authorized to purchase for use abroad any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), at a cost of not to exceed the equivalent of \$2,200 for each such vehicle.*

On page 34 in connection with "Federal-aid Airport Program" Department of Commerce:

*and the contract authorization heretofore granted for the foregoing purposes may hereafter be accounted for under this head.*

On page 35 in connection with "Air Navigation Development" Department of Commerce:

*Provided, That the appropriation granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall remain available during the current fiscal year and may hereafter be accounted for under this head, and not to exceed \$80,000 of such appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses.*

On page 37 in connection with the "Coast and Geodetic Survey" Department of Commerce:

*Provided further, That during the current fiscal year, this appropriation shall be reimbursed (to the extent and in the manner required by law (44 U. S. C. 246) for charts sold to the general public) for charts published by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and furnished for the official use of the military departments of the Department of Defense.*

On page 40 in connection with the appropriation for "Elimination of Grade Crossings" Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce:

*Provided, That the amounts authorized for the elimination of grade crossing hazards by said section and apportioned to Hawaii are hereby reduced by \$188,075.*

On page 43 in connection with "General Provisions" Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce:

*at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem.*

On page 45 in connection with "Radio Propagation and Standards" Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce:

*Provided, That during the current fiscal year the maximum base rate of compensation for employees appointed pursuant to the Act of July 21, 1950 (Public Law 618), shall be \$6,400 per annum:*

On pages 46 and 47 in connection with the appropriation for the "Weather Bureau" Department of Commerce:

*Provided further, That such sums, as may be determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary, may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation to the Department of State for "Contributions to International Organizations, 1952", for contribution to the International Civil Aviation Organization for the United States share of the costs of the meteorological installation in Iceland, when said installation is transferred for operation under the "Agreement on Air Navigation Services in Iceland".*

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1951 AND THE ESTIMATES FOR 1952 PERMANENT IN-

DEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS

|                                            | Appropriations, 1951 | Estimates, 1952 | Increase (+) or decrease (—) |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| DEPARTMENT OF STATE                        |                      |                 |                              |
| Replacement of personal property sold----- | \$76, 780            | \$79, 900       | +\$3, 120                    |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE                      |                      |                 |                              |
| Replacement of personal property sold----- | 220, 000             | 308, 000        | +88, 000                     |
| DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE                     |                      |                 |                              |
| Replacement of personal property sold----- | 54, 125              | 50, 000         | —4, 125                      |
| THE JUDICIARY                              |                      |                 |                              |
| Replacement of personal property sold----- | 1, 000               | 1, 000          | -----                        |
| Total-----                                 | 351, 905             | 438, 900        | +86, 995                     |

## TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against revenue]

| Object                                                                      | Estimates, 1951 | Estimates, 1952 | Increase (+) or decrease (-) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| DEPARTMENT OF STATE                                                         |                 |                 |                              |
| Foreign Service retirement and disability fund-----                         | \$1, 355, 000   | \$1, 450, 000   | + \$95, 000                  |
| Mexican claims fund-----                                                    | 2, 500, 000     | 2, 500, 000     | -----                        |
| Miscellaneous trust funds-----                                              | 132, 800        | 42, 800         | - 90, 000                    |
| Total, Department of State-----                                             | 3, 987, 800     | 3, 992, 800     | + 5, 000                     |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE                                                       |                 |                 |                              |
| Legal activities and general administration: Miscellaneous trust funds----- | 1, 900, 000     | 2, 000, 000     | + 100, 000                   |
| Federal Prison System: Commissary funds-----                                | 1, 064, 460     | 1, 067, 000     | + 2, 540                     |
| Total, Department of Justice-----                                           | 2, 964, 460     | 3, 067, 000     | + 102, 540                   |
| DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE                                                      |                 |                 |                              |
| Office of the Secretary-----                                                | 129, 027        | 64, 500         | - 64, 527                    |
| Bureau of the Census-----                                                   | 250, 000        | 250, 000        | -----                        |
| Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce-----                                | 14, 000         | 15, 000         | + 1, 000                     |
| Bureau of Public Roads-----                                                 | 900, 000        | 900, 000        | -----                        |
| Total, Department of Commerce-----                                          | 1, 293, 027     | 1, 229, 500     | - 63, 527                    |
| Total, trust funds-----                                                     | 8, 245, 287     | 8, 289, 300     | + 44, 013                    |

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

| Agency and item                                            | Approved 1951    |                            | Estimates, 1952 | Recommended in bill for 1952 | Bill compared with—              |                |
|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
|                                                            | Specific amounts | As reduced under Sec. 1214 |                 |                              | 1951, as reduced under Sec. 1214 | 1952 estimates |
| DEPARTMENT OF STATE                                        |                  |                            |                 |                              |                                  |                |
| Institute of Inter-American Affairs                        | \$1, 000, 000    |                            |                 |                              |                                  |                |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE                                      |                  |                            |                 |                              |                                  |                |
| Federal Prison System, buildings and facilities            | 700, 000         | \$700, 000                 |                 |                              | —\$700, 000                      |                |
| DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE                                     |                  |                            |                 |                              |                                  |                |
| Civil Aeronautics Administration:                          |                  |                            |                 |                              |                                  |                |
| Air navigation facilities                                  | 16, 000, 000     | 13, 500, 000               |                 |                              | —13, 500, 000                    |                |
| Federal-aid airport program                                | 36, 700, 000     | 21, 200, 000               |                 |                              | —21, 200, 000                    |                |
| Air navigation development                                 | 2, 250, 000      | 2, 250, 000                |                 |                              | —2, 250, 000                     |                |
| National Bureau of Standards, construction of laboratories | 3, 915, 000      | 3, 915, 000                |                 |                              | —3, 915, 000                     |                |
| Total, Department of Commerce                              | 58, 865, 000     | 40, 865, 000               |                 |                              | —40, 865, 000                    |                |
| Total for all departments                                  | 60, 565, 000     | 41, 565, 000               |                 |                              | —41, 565, 000                    |                |

NOTE.—Table does not include contract authority for Bureau of Public Roads which is granted in substantive legislation.



## ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

| Corporation                          | Authorizations, 1951 | Estimates, 1952 | Recommended in bill for 1952 | Bill compared with— |                |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
|                                      |                      |                 |                              | 1951 authorization  | 1952 estimates |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE                |                      |                 |                              |                     |                |
| Federal Prison Industries, Inc.----- | \$715, 000           | \$731, 000      | \$731, 000                   | +\$16, 000          | -----          |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1951 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED  
IN BILL FOR 1952

## TITLE I.—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

| Agency and item                                                | Appropriations, 1951 |                            | Estimates, 1952 | Recommended in bill for 1952 | Bill compared with—              |                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
|                                                                | Specific amount      | As reduced under sec. 1214 |                 |                              | 1951, as reduced under sec. 1214 | 1952 estimate  |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                     | \$78, 600, 000       | \$78, 492, 000             | \$77, 400, 000  | \$75, 500, 000               | —\$2, 992, 000                   | —\$1, 900, 000 |
| Representation allowances-----                                 | 675, 000             | 675, 000                   | 1, 000, 000     | 850, 000                     | +175, 000                        | —150, 000      |
| Payment to Foreign Service retirement and disability fund----- |                      |                            | 4, 627, 000     | -----                        | -----                            | —4, 627, 000   |
| Acquisition of buildings abroad-----                           | 6, 500, 000          | 2, 950, 000                | 9, 000, 000     | 8, 000, 000                  | +5, 050, 000                     | —1, 000, 000   |
| Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service-----        | 10, 575, 000         | 10, 575, 000               | 19, 900, 000    | 9, 900, 000                  | —675, 000                        | —10, 000, 000  |
| Contributions to international organizations-----              | 54, 449, 297         | 53, 549, 297               | 30, 684, 476    | 29, 300, 000                 | —24, 249, 297                    | —1, 384, 476   |

|                                                                        |                          |                          |                  |             |             |             |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Missions to international organizations-----                           | 1,600,000                | 1,600,000                | 1,570,000        | 1,400,000   | -200,000    | -170,000    |
| International contingencies-----                                       | 2,900,000                | 2,800,000                | 2,800,000        | 2,700,000   | -100,000    | -100,000    |
| International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: |                          |                          |                  |             |             |             |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                             | 1,000,000                | 900,000                  | 1,200,000        | 900,000     | -----       | -300,000    |
| Construction-----                                                      | 3,000,000                | 1,300,000                | 16,200,000       | 14,000,000  | +12,700,000 | -2,200,000  |
| Rio Grande emergency flood protection-----                             | 30,000                   | 30,000                   | 50,000           | 30,000      | -----       | -20,000     |
| American sections, international commissions-----                      | 1,508,000                | 1,508,000                | 2,990,000        | 702,000     | +194,000    | -288,000    |
| International Claims Commission-----                                   | -----                    | -----                    | 265,000          | 150,000     | +150,000    | -115,000    |
| International information and educational activities-----              | <sup>3</sup> 106,089,789 | <sup>3</sup> 106,089,789 | 115,000,000      | 85,000,000  | -21,089,789 | -30,000,000 |
| Philippine rehabilitation-----                                         | 10,000,000               | 10,000,000               | 3,000,000        | 3,000,000   | -7,000,000  | -----       |
| The Institute of Inter-American Affairs-----                           | <sup>4</sup> 5,000,000   | 5,000,000                | ( <sup>5</sup> ) | -----       | -5,000,000  | -----       |
| Total, regular annual appropriations, Department of State-----         | 280,927,086              | 274,469,086              | 283,686,476      | 231,432,000 | -43,037,086 | -52,254,476 |

<sup>1</sup> Plus \$36,500 derived by transfer.<sup>2</sup> Includes \$120,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 66.<sup>3</sup> Plus not to exceed \$15,212,000 in counterpart funds.<sup>4</sup> Plus contract authority of \$1,000,000.<sup>5</sup> To be submitted as part of technical assistance program in foreign-aid bill.

*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1952—Continued*

**TITLE II.—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

| Agency and item                                                    | Appropriations, 1951 |                            | Estimates, 1952 | Recommended in bill for 1952 | Bill compared with—              |               |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|
|                                                                    | Specific amounts     | As reduced under sec. 1214 |                 |                              | 1951, as reduced under sec. 1214 | 1952 estimate |
| LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION                        |                      |                            |                 |                              |                                  |               |
| General administration, salaries and expenses-----                 | \$2, 175, 000        | \$2, 175, 000              | \$2, 363, 000   | \$2, 250, 000                | +\$75, 000                       | —\$113, 000   |
| General legal activities, salaries and expenses-----               | 7, 905, 000          | 7, 905, 000                | 19, 332, 000    | 9, 032, 000                  | +1, 127, 000                     | —300, 000     |
| Antitrust Division, salaries and expenses-----                     | 3, 750, 000          | 3, 750, 000                | 3, 700, 000     | 3, 200, 000                  | —550, 000                        | —500, 000     |
| United States attorneys and marshals, salaries and expenses-----   | 12, 847, 000         | 12, 747, 000               | 13, 030, 000    | 12, 990, 000                 | +243, 000                        | —40, 000      |
| Fees and expenses of witnesses-----                                | 1, 000, 000          | 1, 000, 000                | 1, 500, 000     | 1, 000, 000                  | -----                            | —500, 000     |
| Claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, salaries and expenses----- | 1, 300, 000          | 690, 000                   | 750, 000        | 725, 000                     | +35, 000                         | —25, 000      |
| Total, legal activities and general administration-----            | 28, 977, 000         | 28, 267, 000               | 30, 675, 000    | 29, 197, 000                 | +930, 000                        | —1, 478, 000  |
| FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION                                    |                      |                            |                 |                              |                                  |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                         | 69, 272, 000         | 69, 272, 000               | 290, 665, 000   | 90, 000, 000                 | +20, 728, 000                    | —665, 000     |

|                                                                          |                          |                          |                           |                |                |               |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION<br>SERVICE                                | 34, 400, 000             | 34, 340, 000             | 36, 700, 000              | 36, 500, 000   | + 2, 160, 000  | - 200, 000    |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                               |                          |                          |                           |                |                |               |
| FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM                                                    |                          |                          |                           |                |                |               |
| Bureau of Prisons, salaries and ex-<br>penses-----                       | 22, 179, 000             | 22, 179, 000             | <sup>3</sup> 23, 741, 000 | 23, 500, 000   | + 1, 321, 000  | - 241, 000    |
| Buildings and facilities-----                                            | <sup>4</sup> 2, 180, 000 | <sup>4</sup> 2, 150, 000 | 475, 000                  | 470, 000       | - 1, 680, 000  | - 5, 000      |
| Support of United States prisoners----                                   | 2, 014, 000              | 2, 014, 000              | 2, 100, 000               | 2, 000, 000    | - 14, 000      | - 100, 000    |
| Total, Federal prison system----                                         | 26, 373, 000             | 26, 343, 000             | 26, 316, 000              | 25, 970, 000   | - 373, 000     | - 346, 000    |
| OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY                                                 |                          |                          |                           |                |                |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                               | ( 4, 150, 000)           | ( 4, 150, 000)           | ( 4, 100, 000)            | ( 3, 600, 000) | ( - 550, 000)  | ( - 500, 000) |
| Total, regular annual appro-<br>priations, Department of<br>Justice----- | 159, 022, 000            | 158, 222, 000            | 184, 356, 000             | 181, 667, 000  | + 23, 445, 000 | - 2, 689, 000 |

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$260,000 in H. Doc. No. 139.<sup>2</sup> Includes \$26,798,000 in H. Doc. No. 66.<sup>3</sup> Includes \$775,000 in H. Doc. No. 94.<sup>4</sup> Plus contract authority of \$700,000.



*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1952—Continued*

### TITLE III.—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

| Agency and item                                                               | Appropriations, 1951 (comparable) |                            | Estimates, 1952 | Recommended in bill for 1952 | Bill compared with—              |               |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|
|                                                                               | Specific amounts                  | As reduced under sec. 1214 |                 |                              | 1951, as reduced under sec. 1214 | 1952 estimate |
| OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY                                                       |                                   |                            |                 |                              |                                  |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                                    | \$1, 350, 000                     | \$1, 350, 000              | \$1, 636, 000   | \$1, 500, 000                | +\$150, 000                      | —\$136, 000   |
| Technical and scientific services-----                                        | 225, 000                          | 225, 000                   | 300, 000        | 250, 000                     | +25, 000                         | —50, 000      |
| Total, Office of the Secretary-----                                           | 1, 575, 000                       | 1, 575, 000                | 1, 936, 000     | \$1, 750, 000                | +175, 000                        | —186, 000     |
| CENSUS BUREAU                                                                 |                                   |                            |                 |                              |                                  |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                                    | 7, 007, 000                       | 7, 007, 000                | 7, 170, 000     | 7, 100, 000                  | +93, 000                         | —70, 000      |
| Seventeenth Decennial Census-----                                             | 28, 500, 000                      | 28, 500, 000               | 8, 800, 000     | 7, 000, 000                  | —21, 500, 000                    | —1, 800, 000  |
| Census of Governments-----                                                    | -----                             | -----                      | 2, 250, 000     | -----                        | -----                            | —2, 250, 000  |
| Census of business, transportation, manufactures, and mineral industries----- | -----                             | -----                      | 300, 000        | 200, 000                     | +200, 000                        | —100, 000     |
| Total, Census Bureau-----                                                     | 35, 507, 000                      | 35, 507, 000               | 18, 520, 000    | 14, 300, 000                 | —21, 207, 000                    | —4, 220, 000  |
| CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION                                              |                                   |                            |                 |                              |                                  |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                                    | 98, 500, 000                      | 98, 500, 000               | 102, 800, 000   | 99, 100, 000                 | +600, 000                        | —3, 700, 000  |
| Air navigation facilities, establishment of-----                              | 1 27, 500, 000                    | 2 27, 500, 000             | 37, 150, 000    | 20, 000, 000                 | —7, 500, 000                     | —17, 150, 000 |

|                                                          |                           |                           |                          |               |               |               |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Technical development and evaluation-----                | 1, 375, 000               | 1, 375, 000               | 1, 375, 000              | 1, 200, 000   | -175, 000     | -175, 000     |
| Washington National Airport:                             |                           |                           |                          |               |               |               |
| Maintenance and operation-----                           | 1, 300, 000               | 1, 300, 000               | 1, 350, 000              | 1, 300, 000   | -----         | -50, 000      |
| Construction-----                                        | 540, 000                  | 540, 000                  | 75, 000                  | 75, 000       | -465, 000     | -----         |
| Land acquisition, additional,<br>Washington Airport----- | 1, 000, 000               | 1, 000, 000               | -----                    | -----         | -1, 000, 000  | -----         |
| Federal-aid airport program-----                         | <sup>3</sup> 37, 000, 000 | <sup>4</sup> 37, 000, 000 | 54, 000, 000             | 35, 840, 000  | -1, 160, 000  | -18, 160, 000 |
| Alaska airports:                                         |                           |                           |                          |               |               |               |
| Construction-----                                        | 3, 200, 000               | 3, 200, 000               | -----                    | -----         | -3, 200, 000  | -----         |
| Maintenance and operation-----                           | -----                     | -----                     | 450, 000                 | 225, 000      | +225, 000     | -225, 000     |
| Air navigation development-----                          | <sup>5</sup> 6, 000, 000  | <sup>5</sup> 5, 551, 000  | <sup>6</sup> 1, 883, 000 | 1, 883, 000   | -3, 668, 000  | -----         |
| Transport aircraft development-----                      | -----                     | -----                     | <sup>7</sup> 600, 000    | -----         | -----         | -600, 000     |
| Claims, Federal Airport Act-----                         | 1, 622, 886               | 1, 622, 886               | -----                    | -----         | -1, 622, 886  | -----         |
| Total, Civil Aeronautics Administration-----             | 178, 037, 886             | 177, 588, 886             | 199, 683, 000            | 159, 623, 000 | -17, 965, 886 | -40, 060, 000 |
| CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD                                  |                           |                           |                          |               |               |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----                               | 3, 500, 000               | 3, 500, 000               | 3, 900, 000              | 3, 550, 000   | +50, 000      | -350, 000     |

<sup>1</sup> Plus \$16,000,000 in contract authority.<sup>2</sup> Plus \$13,500,000 in contract authority.<sup>3</sup> Plus \$36,700,000 in contract authority.<sup>4</sup> Plus \$21,200,000 in contract authority.<sup>5</sup> Plus \$2,250,000 in contract authority.<sup>6</sup> Includes decrease of \$6,117,000 as contained in H. Doc. No. 100.<sup>7</sup> Contained in H. Doc. No. 178.

## Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1952—Continued

## TITLE III.—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued

| Agency and item                                     | Appropriations, 1951 (comparable) |                            | Estimates, 1952 | Recommended in bill for 1952 | Bill compared with—              |               |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|
|                                                     | Specific amounts                  | As reduced under sec. 1214 |                 |                              | 1951, as reduced under sec. 1214 | 1952 estimate |
| COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY                           |                                   |                            |                 |                              |                                  |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----                          | \$12,035,000                      | \$12,035,000               | \$ 12,775,000   | \$12,375,000                 | +\$340,000                       | —\$400,000    |
| BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE             |                                   |                            |                 |                              |                                  |               |
| Departmental salaries and expenses-----             | 5,150,000                         | 5,150,000                  | 3,339,000       | 3,000,000                    | —2,150,000                       | —339,000      |
| Field office service-----                           | 2,155,000                         | 2,155,000                  | 2,130,000       | 1,900,000                    | —255,000                         | —230,000      |
| Export control-----                                 | 2,925,000                         | 2,925,000                  | 5,900,000       | 5,500,000                    | +2,575,000                       | —400,000      |
| Total, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce----- | 10,230,000                        | 10,230,000                 | 11,369,000      | 10,400,000                   | +170,000                         | —969,000      |
| PATENT OFFICE                                       |                                   |                            |                 |                              |                                  |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----                          | 11,500,000                        | 11,500,000                 | 11,600,000      | 11,500,000                   | -----                            | —100,000      |
| BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS                              |                                   |                            |                 |                              |                                  |               |
| Federal aid, highway construction-----              | 385,000,000                       | 385,000,000                | 420,000,000     | 325,000,000                  | —60,000,000                      | —95,000,000   |
| Elimination of grade crossings-----                 | 4,600,000                         | 4,600,000                  | 5,211,925       | 3,000,000                    | —1,600,000                       | —2,211,925    |
| Forest highways-----                                | 22,500,000                        | 22,500,000                 | 25,000,000      | 21,000,000                   | —1,500,000                       | —4,000,000    |

|                                                     |                           |                           |                           |               |                 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| Tongass Forest Highway, Alaska-----                 | 3, 500, 000               | 3, 500, 000               | 3, 500, 000               | 3, 500, 000   | -----           |
| Access roads-----                                   | (10)                      | (10)                      | (10)                      | (10)          | -----           |
| War and emergency damages, Territory of Hawaii----- |                           |                           | 2, 000, 000               | + 2, 000, 000 | -----           |
| Inter-American Highway-----                         | 4, 000, 000               | 4, 000, 000               | 4, 000, 000               | -----         | -----           |
| Public Lands highways-----                          | 750, 000                  | 750, 000                  | -----                     | -- 750, 000   | -----           |
| Access roads (act of Sept. 7, 1950)-----            | <sup>11</sup> 5, 000, 000 | <sup>11</sup> 5, 000, 000 | <sup>12</sup> 3, 000, 000 | 1, 000, 000   | - 2, 000, 000   |
| Total, Bureau of Roads-----                         | 425, 350, 000             | 425, 350, 000             | 462, 711, 925             | 359, 500, 000 | - 103, 211, 925 |
| NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS                        |                           |                           |                           |               |                 |
| Operation and administration-----                   | 1, 270, 000               | 1, 270, 000               | 1, 209, 000               | 1, 100, 000   | - 109, 000      |
| Research and testing-----                           | 4, 300, 000               | 4, 300, 000               | 4, 150, 000               | 4, 000, 000   | - 150, 000      |
| Radio propagation and standards-----                | 3, 000, 000               | 3, 000, 000               | 2, 900, 000               | 2, 800, 000   | - 100, 000      |
| Construction of laboratories-----                   | <sup>13</sup> 1, 900, 000 | <sup>13</sup> 1, 900, 000 | 3, 915, 000               | 3, 800, 000   | - 115, 000      |
| Working capital fund-----                           |                           |                           | <sup>14</sup> 2, 000, 000 | 2, 000, 000   | -----           |
| Total, National Bureau of Standards-----            | 10, 470, 000              | 10, 470, 000              | 14, 174, 000              | 13, 700, 000  | - 474, 000      |

<sup>8</sup> Includes \$325,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 100.<sup>9</sup> Contained in H. Doc. No. 139.<sup>10</sup> Not to exceed \$70,000 of unexpended balance made available.<sup>11</sup> Plus \$2,000,000 derived by transfer.<sup>12</sup> Contained in H. Doc. No. 139.<sup>13</sup> Plus contract authority of \$3,915,000.<sup>14</sup> Contained in H. Doc. No. 139.



*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1952—Continued*

**TITLE III.—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued**

| Agency and item                                                   | Appropriations, 1951 (comparable) |                            | Recommended in bill for 1952 | Bill compared with—              |                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|
|                                                                   | Specific amounts                  | As reduced under sec. 1214 |                              | 1951, as reduced under sec. 1214 | 1952 estimate  |
| WEATHER BUREAU                                                    |                                   |                            |                              |                                  |                |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                        | \$24, 897, 000                    | \$24, 897, 000             | \$26, 000, 000               | +\$1, 103, 000                   | —\$1, 095, 000 |
| Total, regular annual appropriations, Department of Commerce----- | 713, 101, 886                     | 712, 652, 886              | 612, 698, 000                | —99, 954, 886                    | —151, 065, 925 |

<sup>15</sup> Includes \$475,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 100.

TITLE IV.—THE JUDICIARY

| Agency and item                                 | Appropriations, 1951 |                                         | Estimates, 1952 | Recommended in bill for 1952 | Bill compared with—                           |               |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------|
|                                                 | Specific amounts     | As reduced under sec. 1214 <sup>1</sup> |                 |                              | 1951, as reduced under sec. 1214 <sup>1</sup> | 1952 estimate |
| SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES              |                      |                                         |                 |                              |                                               |               |
| Salaries-----                                   | \$915, 000           | \$915, 000                              | \$928, 000      | \$928, 000                   | +\$13, 000                                    | -----         |
| Printing and binding Supreme Court reports----- | 91, 200              | 91, 200                                 | 91, 200         | 91, 200                      | -----                                         | -----         |
| Miscellaneous expenses-----                     | 52, 100              | 52, 100                                 | 58, 350         | 58, 350                      | +6, 250                                       | -----         |
| Care of the building and grounds-----           | 159, 200             | 159, 200                                | 160, 700        | 160, 700                     | +1, 500                                       | -----         |
| Total, Supreme Court-----                       | 1, 217, 500          | 1, 217, 500                             | 1, 238, 250     | 1, 238, 250                  | +20, 750                                      | -----         |
| COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS             |                      |                                         |                 |                              |                                               |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----                      | 192, 200             | 192, 200                                | 194, 500        | 194, 500                     | +2, 300                                       | -----         |
| CUSTOMS COURT                                   |                      |                                         |                 |                              |                                               |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----                      | 417, 465             | 417, 465                                | 438, 465        | 433, 165                     | +15, 700                                      | —\$5, 300     |

<sup>1</sup> Sec. 1214 not applicable to the Judiciary.

## Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1952—Continued

## TITLE IV.—THE JUDICIARY—Continued

| Agency and item               | Appropriations, 1951 |                                         | Estimates, 1952 | Recommended in bill for 1952 | Bill compared with—                           |               |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|---------------|
|                               | Specific amounts     | As reduced under sec. 1214 <sup>1</sup> |                 |                              | 1951, as reduced under sec. 1214 <sup>1</sup> | 1952 estimate |
|                               |                      |                                         |                 |                              |                                               |               |
| COURT OF CLAIMS               |                      |                                         |                 |                              |                                               |               |
| Salaries and expenses-----    | \$575, 000           | \$575, 000                              | \$590, 000      | \$579, 800                   | +\$4, 800                                     | —\$10, 200    |
| Repairs and improvements----- | 10, 700              | 10, 700                                 | 159, 100        | 9, 100                       | —1, 600                                       | —150, 000     |
| Total, Court of Claims-----   | 585, 700             | 585, 700                                | 749, 100        | 588, 900                     | +3, 200                                       | +160, 200     |
| OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES     |                      |                                         |                 |                              |                                               |               |
| Hawaii-----                   | 106, 500             | 106, 500                                | 2 124, 500      | 120, 000                     | +13, 500                                      | —4, 500       |
| Salaries of judges-----       | 5, 095, 000          | 5, 095, 000                             | 5, 138, 125     | 5, 120, 000                  | +25, 000                                      | —18, 125      |
| Salaries of clerks-----       | 4, 470, 000          | 4, 470, 000                             | 4, 614, 000     | 4, 520, 000                  | +50, 000                                      | —94, 000      |
| Probation system-----         | 2, 145, 000          | 2, 145, 000                             | 2, 198, 700     | 2, 180, 000                  | +35, 000                                      | —18, 700      |
| Salaries of criers-----       | 520, 000             | 520, 000                                | 542, 300        | 542, 300                     | +22, 300                                      | -----         |
| Fees of commissioners-----    | 475, 000             | 475, 000                                | 543, 000        | 543, 000                     | +68, 000                                      | -----         |
| Fees of jurors-----           | 2, 900, 000          | 2, 900, 000                             | 2, 900, 000     | 2, 800, 000                  | —100, 000                                     | —100, 000     |
| Miscellaneous salaries-----   | 2, 600, 000          | 2, 600, 000                             | 2, 682, 700     | 2, 670, 000                  | +70, 000                                      | —12, 700      |
| Miscellaneous expenses-----   | 675, 000             | 675, 000                                | 795, 800        | 750, 000                     | +75, 000                                      | —45, 800      |
| Travel expenses-----          | 725, 000             | 725, 000                                | 725, 000        | 715, 000                     | —10, 000                                      | —10, 000      |

|                                                                                                                      |                  |                  |                  |                |                |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Salaries of court reporters-----                                                                                     | 972, 000         | 972, 000         | 988, 200         | +16, 200       | -----          |
| Administrative Office, salaries and expenses-----                                                                    | 520, 000         | 520, 000         | 535, 000         | +15, 000       | -2, 900        |
| Repairs and improvements, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia-----                      | 7, 100           | 7, 100           | 7, 100           | -----          | -8, 500        |
| Repairs and improvements, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia-----                           | 6, 200           | 6, 200           | 3, 700           | -2, 500        | -----          |
| Referees, special account:                                                                                           |                  |                  |                  |                |                |
| Salaries-----                                                                                                        | 879, 000         | 879, 000         | 879, 000         | -----          | -----          |
| Expenses-----                                                                                                        | 995, 000         | 995, 000         | 1, 090, 000      | +95, 000       | -90, 900       |
| Total, other courts and services-----                                                                                | 23, 090, 800     | 23, 090, 800     | 23, 869, 425     | +372, 500      | -406, 125      |
| Total, title IV, the Judiciary-----                                                                                  | 25, 503, 665     | 25, 503, 665     | 25, 918, 115     | +414, 450      | -571, 625      |
| Grand total appropriations titles I, II, III, and IV Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary----- | 1, 178, 554, 637 | 1, 170, 847, 637 | 1, 258, 296, 141 | -119, 132, 522 | -206, 581, 026 |

<sup>1</sup> Sec. 1214 not applicable to the Judiciary.<sup>2</sup> Includes \$7,500 contained in House Doc. No. 162.





Union Calendar No. 210

82<sup>D</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

**H. R. 4740**

[Report No. 685]

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 10, 1951

Mr. ROONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

**A BILL**

Making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4       in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-  
5       ments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for  
6       the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely:

## TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Department of State not otherwise provided for, including expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r) ; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of aircraft outside the continental United States; printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111) ; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; purchase of uniforms; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by contract, for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; establishment, maintenance, and operation of passport and despatch agencies; examina-

tion of estimates of appropriations in the field; ice and drinking water for use abroad; excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; loss by exchange; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; relief, protection, and burial of American seamen, and alien seamen in foreign countries and in the United States Territories and possessions; expenses incurred in acknowledging services of officers and crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing American seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or other catastrophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining in Egypt, Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court, and care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical information, (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids, (4) maintenance, improvement, and repair of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries, including minor construction on Government-owned properties, (5) fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased



1 property abroad, and (6) rental or lease, for periods not  
2 exceeding ten years, of offices, buildings, grounds, and living  
3 quarters for the use of the Foreign Service, for which pay-  
4 ments may be made in advance; \$75,500,000: *Provided*,  
5 That not less than \$10,000,000 of this appropriation shall be  
6 used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or  
7 owned by the Treasury of the United States for carrying out  
8 the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That  
9 pursuant to section 201 (c) of the Act of June 30, 1949  
10 (41 U. S. C. 231c), passenger motor vehicles in possession  
11 of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold  
12 and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall  
13 be available without fiscal year limitation for replacement  
14 of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including  
15 the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not  
16 exceed \$3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile  
17 at each diplomatic mission and \$1,400 in the case of all other  
18 such vehicles except station wagons.

19 REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

20 For representation allowances as authorized by sec-  
21 tion 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.  
22 S. C. 1131), \$850,000.

23 ACQUISITION OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

24 For carrying into effect the Act of July 25, 1946  
25 (22 U. S. C. 295b), including the initial alterations, re-

1 pair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said Act,  
2 \$8,000,000, which is exclusively for expenditure under the  
3 provisions of said Act which relate to payments representing  
4 the value of foreign property or credits: *Provided*, That,  
5 when specifically authorized by the Secretary of State or  
6 such Assistant Secretary as he may designate, section 6 of  
7 the Act of May 7, 1926, may be construed as including  
8 leaseholds of not less than ten years.

#### 9 EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR

#### 10 SERVICE

11 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of  
12 State to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Dip-  
13 lomatic and Consular Service, to be expended pursuant to  
14 the requirement of section 291 of the Revised Statutes (31  
15 U. S. C. 107), \$9,900,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary  
16 of State may delegate to subordinate officials the authority  
17 vested in him by section 291 of the Revised Statutes pertain-  
18 ing to certification of expenditures.

#### 19 CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

20 For expenses necessary to meet annual obligations to  
21 international organizations, the Government of Panama, and  
22 Gorgas Memorial Institute, pursuant to treaties, conventions,  
23 or specific Acts of Congress, \$29,300,000: *Provided*, That  
24 the Department of State, when requested by the United  
25 Nations, is authorized to acquire surplus property for the

1 United Nations in accordance with existing surplus property  
2 disposal laws and regulations, and the contribution of the  
3 United States to the United Nations shall be reduced by  
4 the value of the surplus property and necessary expenses,  
5 including transportation costs, incidental to the acquisition  
6 thereof.

#### 7 MISSIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

8 For expenses necessary for permanent representation to  
9 certain international organizations in which the United States  
10 participates pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific  
11 Acts of Congress, including expenses authorized by the  
12 pertinent Acts and Conventions providing for such repre-  
13 sentation; attendance at meetings of societies or associations  
14 concerned with the work of the organizations; salaries, ex-  
15 penses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as  
16 authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended  
17 (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); purchase (not to exceed one,  
18 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;  
19 printing and binding, without regard to section 11 of the  
20 Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); and purchase  
21 of uniforms for guards and chauffeurs, \$1,400,000;  
22 *Provided*, That the provisions of section 8 of the United  
23 Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, and regula-  
24 tions thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant

1 to that Act, may be applicable to the obligation and expendi-  
2 ture of funds in connection with United States participation  
3 in the International Civil Aviation Organization.

#### 4 INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES

5 For necessary expenses of participation by the United  
6 States upon approval by the Secretary of State, in inter-  
7 national activities which arise from time to time in the  
8 conduct of foreign affairs and for which specific appropria-  
9 tions have not been provided pursuant to treaties, conven-  
10 tions, or special Acts of Congress, including personal services  
11 without regard to civil-service and classification laws; salaries,  
12 expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as  
13 authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended  
14 (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); employment of aliens; travel ex-  
15 penses without regard to the Standardized Government  
16 Travel Regulations and without regard to the rates of per  
17 diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the  
18 Travel Expense Act of 1949; not to exceed \$15 per diem  
19 in lieu of subsistence for persons serving without compen-  
20 sation in an advisory capacity while away from their homes  
21 or regular places of business; rent of quarters by contract  
22 or otherwise; hire of passenger motor vehicles; con-  
23 tributions for the share of the United States in expenses of  
24 international organizations; and printing and binding without  
25 regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44



1 U. S. C. 111) ; \$2,700,000, of which not to exceed  
2 a total of \$100,000 may be expended for representation  
3 allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Act of  
4 August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131) and for entertainment.

5 INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,  
6 UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

7 For expenses necessary to enable the United States to  
8 meet its obligations under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905,  
9 1906, 1933, and 1944 between the United States and  
10 Mexico, and to comply with the other laws applicable to  
11 the United States Section, International Boundary and  
12 Water Commission, United States and Mexico, including  
13 operation and maintenance of the Rio Grande rectification,  
14 canalization, flood control, bank protection, boundary fence,  
15 and sanitation projects; detailed plan preparation and con-  
16 struction (including surveys and operation and maintenance  
17 and protection during construction) ; Rio Grande emergency  
18 flood protection; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles  
19 for replacement only; purchase of planographs and litho-  
20 graphs; and leasing of private property to remove therefrom  
21 sand, gravel, stone, and other materials, without regard to  
22 section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41  
23 U. S. C. 5) ; as follows;

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses, regular boundary activities, including examinations, preliminary surveys, and investigations, \$900,000.

## CONSTRUCTION

For detailed plan preparation and construction of projects authorized by the Convention concluded February 1, 1933, between the United States and Mexico, the Acts approved August 19, 1935, as amended (22 U. S. C. 277-277f), August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 961), June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1463), June 28, 1941 (22 U. S. C. 277f), September 13, 1950 (Public Law 786), and the projects stipulated in the treaty between the United States and Mexico signed at Washington on February 3, 1944, \$14,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for the lower Rio Grande flood-control project for construction on any land, site, or easement in connection with this project except such as has been acquired by donation and the title thereto has been approved by the Attorney General of the United States: *Provided further*, That expenditures for the Rio Grande bank-protection proj-

1   ect shall be subject to the provisions and conditions con-  
2   tained in the appropriation for said project as provided  
3   by the Act approved April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 89) : *Pro-*  
4   *vided further,* That unexpended balances of appropriations  
5   for construction under the International Boundary and  
6   Water Commission available for the next preceding fiscal  
7   year shall be merged with this appropriation and shall  
8   continue available until expended.

9                   RIO GRANDE EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION

10       For emergency flood-control work, including protection,  
11   reconstruction, and repair of all structures under the juris-  
12   diction of the International Boundary and Water Com-  
13   mission, United States and Mexico, threatened or damaged  
14   by floodwaters of the Rio Grande, which have heretofore  
15   been authorized and erected under the provisions of treaties  
16   between the United States and Mexico, or in pursuance of  
17   Federal laws authorizing improvements on the Rio Grande,  
18   \$30,000, to be merged with the unobligated balance of the  
19   appropriation for this purpose for the next preceding fiscal  
20   year, and to remain available until expended.

21                  AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

22       For expenses necessary to enable the President to per-  
23   form the obligations of the United States pursuant to con-  
24   ventions between the United States and Canada signed  
25   May 26, 1930 (50 Stat. 1355) and January 29, 1937

1 (50 Stat. 1351), treaties between the United States and  
 2 Great Britain, in respect to Canada, signed January 11,  
 3 1909 (36 Stat. 2448) and February 24, 1925 (44 Stat.  
 4 2102), the treaty between the United States and Canada  
 5 signed February 27, 1950, and Convention between the  
 6 United States and Costa Rica signed May 31, 1949, including  
 7 stenographic reporting services by contract; hire of passenger  
 8 motor vehicles; the United States share of the expenses of  
 9 the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, the  
 10 International Fisheries Commission, and the Inter-American  
 11 Tropical Tuna Commission, which except for the expenses  
 12 of the members, may be advanced to the respective Com-  
 13 missions; \$702,000, to be disbursed under the direction of  
 14 the Secretary of State and to be available also for addi-  
 15 tional expenses of the American Sections, International  
 16 Commissions, as hereinafter set forth:

17 International Joint Commission, United States and  
 18 Canada, the salary of one Commissioner on the part of the  
 19 United States who shall serve at the pleasure of the Presi-  
 20 dent (the other Commissioners to serve in that capacity  
 21 without compensation therefor) ; salaries of clerks and other  
 22 employees appointed by the Commissioners on the part of  
 23 the United States with the approval solely of the Secretary  
 24 of State; travel expenses and compensation of witnesses in  
 25 attending hearings of the Commission at such places in the



1 United States and Canada as the Commission or the Ameri-  
2 can Commissioners shall determine to be necessary; and  
3 special and technical investigations in connection with mat-  
4 ters falling within the Commission's jurisdiction: *Provided*,  
5 That the Secretary of State is authorized to transfer to any  
6 department or independent establishment of the Government,  
7 with the consent of the head thereof, funds from this appro-  
8 priation for direct expenditure by such department or estab-  
9 lishment for such investigations.

10 International Boundary Commission, United States,  
11 Alaska, and Canada, the completion of such remaining work  
12 as may be required under the award of the Alaskan Bound-  
13 ary Tribunal and the existing treaties between the United  
14 States and Great Britain; commutation of subsistence to em-  
15 ployees while on field duty, not to exceed \$6 per day each  
16 (but not to exceed \$3 per day each when a member of a  
17 field party and subsisting in camp) ; hire of freight and pas-  
18 senger motor vehicles from temporary field employees; and  
19 payment for timber necessarily cut in keeping the boundary  
20 line clear.

#### 21 INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

22 For expenses necessary to enable the Commission to  
23 settle certain claims of the Government of the United States  
24 on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals  
25 against foreign governments as authorized by Public Law

1 455, approved March 10, 1950, including expenses of attend-  
2 ance at meetings of organizations concerned with the pur-  
3 pose of this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles  
4 for field use only; services as authorized by section 15 of  
5 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and employ-  
6 ment of aliens; \$150,000.

7 INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL  
8 ACTIVITIES

9 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of  
10 State to carry out international information and educational  
11 activities as authorized by the United States Information  
12 and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U. S. C. 1431-  
13 1479) and the Act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 501),  
14 and to administer the programs authorized by section 32 (b)  
15 (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50  
16 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b) ), the Act of August 24, 1949 (20  
17 U. S. C. 222-224), and the Act of September 29, 1950  
18 (Public Law 861), including employment, without regard  
19 to the civil-service and classification laws, of (1) persons on  
20 a temporary basis (not to exceed \$120,000), (2) aliens  
21 within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service  
22 in the United States relating to the translation or narration  
23 of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be  
24 investigated for such employment in accordance with pro-  
25 cedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney

1 General) ; travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for  
2 service in the United States and dependents to and from the  
3 United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of per-  
4 sonnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service  
5 Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158) ; expenses  
6 of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided  
7 for under this appropriation (not to exceed \$8,000) ; enter-  
8 tainment within the United States (not to exceed \$5,000) ;  
9 hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of space in foreign  
10 language publications abroad, without regard to the pro-  
11 visions of law set forth in 44 U. S. C. 322; services as au-  
12 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
13 U. S. C. 55a) ; advance of funds notwithstanding section  
14 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; actual expenses  
15 of preparing and transporting to their former homes  
16 the remains of persons, not United States Government em-  
17 ployees, who may die away from their homes while par-  
18 ticipating in activities authorized under this appropriation;  
19 establishment and operation of agricultural and other experi-  
20 ment and demonstration stations in other American countries,  
21 on land acquired by gift or lease, and construction of neces-  
22 sary buildings thereon; radio activities and acquisition and  
23 production of motion pictures and visual materials and pur-  
24 chase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor,  
25 narration, script-writing, translation, and engineering serv-



ices, by contract or otherwise; and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; \$85,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 may be used for representation abroad: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is authorized in making contracts for the use of the international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of leasehold interests payments may be made in advance for the entire term or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 per centum of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of motion-picture films.



## 1 PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION

2 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
3 thority granted under this head in the Department of  
4 State Appropriation Act, 1949, \$3,000,000, to be con-  
5 solidated with appropriations heretofore made under said  
6 head; and the unobligated balance of such consolidated  
7 appropriation shall remain available during the current fiscal  
8 year upon the terms and conditions specified under this  
9 head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1950,  
10 for expenses of liquidation of activities in the Philippines  
11 carried out pursuant to section 302 (a) of the Philippine  
12 Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.  
13 1782, 1791 (e) ), and for carrying out the purposes of  
14 section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946,  
15 as authorized by section 3 of the Act of July 2, 1948 (Public  
16 Law 882) .

## 17 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

18 SEC. 102. Contracts entered into in foreign countries  
19 involving expenditures from any of the appropriations under  
20 this title shall not be subject to the provisions of section  
21 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22) .

22 SEC. 103. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6  
23 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555) , or the pro-  
24 visions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his  
25 absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate

1 the employment of any officer or employee of the Department  
2 of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States  
3 whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or  
4 advisable in the interests of the United States.

5 SEC. 104. The exchange of funds for payment of ex-  
6 penses in connection with the operation of diplomatic and  
7 consular establishments abroad shall not be subject to the  
8 provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31  
9 U. S. C. 543).

10 SEC. 105. Appropriations under this title available for  
11 expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the  
12 continental United States, including travel of dependents and  
13 transportation of personal effects, household goods, or auto-  
14 mobiles of such personnel, shall be available for such ex-  
15 penses when any part of such travel or transportation begins  
16 in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in  
17 that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or  
18 transportation may not be completed during the current fiscal  
19 year.

20 SEC. 106. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 16a  
21 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78 (a)), Govern-  
22 ment-owned vehicles may be used in foreign countries for  
23 transportation of United States Government employees from  
24 their residence to the office and return when public trans-

1   portation facilities are unsafe or are not available: *Provided*,  
 2   That each Chief of Mission shall have prior authority from  
 3   the Secretary of State to approve such transportation.

4       SEC. 107. During the current fiscal year and when pur-  
 5   chases are made with foreign currencies, the Department of  
 6   State is authorized to purchase for use abroad any passenger  
 7   motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station  
 8   wagons), at a cost of not to exceed the equivalent of \$2,200  
 9   for each such vehicle.

10       SEC. 108. Appropriations under this title for "Sala-  
 11   ries and expenses", "International contingencies", and  
 12   "Missions to international organizations" are available for  
 13   reimbursement of the General Services Administration for  
 14   security guard services for protection of confidential files.

15       This title may be cited as the "Department of State  
 16   Appropriation Act, 1952".

## 17           TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### 18       LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

#### 19       SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

20       For expenses necessary for the administration of the  
 21   Department of Justice and for examination of judicial offices,  
 22   including purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for re-  
 23   placement only; miscellaneous and emergency expenses  
 24   authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his  
 25   Administrative Assistant; special attorneys and special as-



1 assistants to the Attorney General; and examination of esti-  
 2 mates of appropriations in the field: \$2,250,000.

### 3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

4 For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the  
 5 Department of Justice not otherwise provided for, including  
 6 miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or ap-  
 7 proved by the Attorney General or his Administrative  
 8 Assistant; and advances of public moneys pursuant to law  
 9 (31 U. S. C. 529) ; \$9,032,000.

### 10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

1 For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust  
 2 and kindred laws, \$3,200,000, of which \$125,000 shall be  
 3 available exclusively for activities in connection with rail-  
 4 road reparations cases: *Provided*, That none of this appro-  
 5 priation shall be expended for the establishment and mainte-  
 6 nance of permanent regional offices of the Antitrust Division.

### 17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS 18 AND MARSHALS

19 For necessary expenses of the offices of United States  
 20 attorneys and marshals and United States district attorneys  
 21 in Alaska, including purchase of not to exceed two passenger  
 22 motor vehicles (one van for replacement only at not to  
 23 exceed \$2,500, and one bus for replacement only at not to  
 24 exceed \$15,000) ; services in Alaska in collecting evidence  
 25 for the United States when specifically directed by the



1 Attorney General; and firearms and ammunition; \$12,990,-  
2 000, of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for  
3 the employment of temporary deputy marshals in lieu of  
4 bailiffs at a rate not to exceed \$10 per day.

5 FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

6 For expenses, mileage, and per diems of witnesses and  
7 for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law;  
8 and not to exceed \$160,000 for such compensation and  
9 expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses) or infor-  
10 mants pursuant to section 1 of Public Law 626, approved  
11 July 28, 1950; \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the  
12 sum herein appropriated shall be used to pay any witness  
13 more than one attendance fee for any one calendar day.

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF  
15 JAPANESE ANCESTRY

16 For expenses necessary for payment of claims of persons  
17 of Japanese ancestry, pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948  
18 (50 U. S. C. 1981-1987), \$725,000, of which not to  
19 exceed \$225,000 shall be available for administrative  
20 expenses.

21 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary for the detection and prosecu-  
24 tion of crimes against the United States; protection of the  
25 person of the President of the United States; acquisition,

1 collection, classification and preservation of identification  
2 and other records and their exchange with the duly author-  
3 ized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities,  
4 and other institutions; and such other investigations regard-  
5 ing official matters under the control of the Department of  
6 Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by  
7 the Attorney General, including purchase (not to exceed  
8 four hundred for replacement only) and hire of passenger  
9 motor vehicles; purchase at not to exceed \$10,000, for  
10 replacement only, of one armored motor vehicle; firearms  
11 and ammunition; not to exceed \$150,000 for repairs and  
12 alterations at the Federal Bureau of Investigation Training  
13 Center, Quantico, Virginia; not to exceed \$10,000 for taxi-  
14 cab hire to be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in  
15 this paragraph; not to exceed \$4,500 for expenses of  
16 attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the  
17 purposes of this appropriation; payment of rewards when  
18 specifically authorized by the Attorney General for infor-  
19 mation leading to the apprehension of fugitives from justice;  
20 and not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies  
21 of a confidential character, to be expended under the direc-  
22 tion of the Attorney General and to be accounted for  
23 solely on his certificate; \$90,000,000: *Provided*, That  
24 of the amount herein appropriated \$100,000 is to be  
25 held as a reserve for emergencies arising in connection with

1 kidnapping, extortion, and bank robbery, to be released for  
2 expenditure in such amounts and at such times as the Attor-  
3 ney General may determine: *Provided further*, That the  
4 compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be \$20,000  
5 per annum so long as the position is held by the present  
6 incumbent.

7       None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau  
8 of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of  
9 any civil-service employee.

#### 10           IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

##### 11                   SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12       For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
13 the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to  
14 immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, includ-  
15 ing advance of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while en  
16 route; payment of allowances (at a rate not in excess of  
17 \$1 per day) to aliens, while held in custody under the  
18 immigration laws, for work performed; payment of rewards  
19 for information leading to the apprehension or conviction  
20 of violators of the immigration laws; not to exceed  
21 \$35,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential  
22 character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney  
23 General and accounted for solely on his certificate; not to  
24 exceed \$5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of  
25 organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropria-



1 tion; purchase (not to exceed one hundred and fifty for  
2 replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;  
3 purchase (not to exceed four for replacement only) and  
4 maintenance and operation of aircraft; firearms and ammu-  
5 nition; refunds of head tax, maintenance bills, immigra-  
6 tion fines, and other items properly returnable, except  
7 deposits of aliens who become public charges and de-  
8 posits to secure payment of fines and passage money;  
9 operation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of build-  
10 ings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto;  
11 reimbursement of the General Services Administration for  
12 security guard services for protection of confidential files;  
13 and maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and  
14 transportation of alien enemies and their wives and de-  
15 pendent children, including return of such persons to place  
16 of bona fide residence or to such other place as may  
17 be authorized by the Attorney General; \$36,500,000.

## 18 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

### 19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

20 For expenses necessary for the administration, opera-  
21 tion, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional  
22 institutions, including not to exceed \$490,000 for depart-  
23 mental personal services; not to exceed \$13,500 for expenses  
24 of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with  
25 the purposes of this appropriation; purchase of not to exceed



1 fourteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only,  
2 including two busses at not to exceed \$20,000 each; com-  
3 pilation of statistics relating to prisoners in Federal and  
4 non-Federal penal and correctional institutions; furnishing  
5 of insignia, uniforms, and other distinctive wearing apparel  
6 necessary for employees in the performance of their official  
7 duties; payment pursuant to law of claims of employees for  
8 loss, damage, or destruction of personal property (31  
9 U. S. C. 238); firearms and ammunition; payment of  
10 rewards for the apprehension, or for information leading to  
11 the recapture, of escaped prisoners; purchase and exchange  
12 of farm products and livestock; construction of buildings at  
13 prison camps; and acquisition of land as authorized by  
14 section 7 of the Act of July 28, 1950 (Public Law 626);  
15 \$23,500,000: *Provided*, That there may be transferred to  
16 the Public Health Service such amounts as may be necessary,  
17 in the discretion of the Attorney General, for direct expendi-  
18 ture by that Service for medical relief for inmates of Federal  
19 penal and correctional institutions.

#### 20 BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

21 For constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary  
22 buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional  
23 institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto,  
24 by contract or force account, \$470,000, of which \$360,000  
25 is for liquidation of authority granted under this head in

1 the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1950, to enter  
2 into contracts for replacement of a power plant at the  
3 United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas: *Pro-*  
4 *vided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used  
5 for work performed under this appropriation.

6 SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

7 For support of United States prisoners in non-Federal  
8 institutions and in the Territory of Alaska, including neces-  
9 sary clothing and medical aid, and payment of rewards for  
10 the apprehension, or for information leading to the recap-  
11 ture, of escaped prisoners; \$2,000,000.

12 OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 The Attorney General, or such officer as he may design-  
15 ate, is hereby authorized to pay out of any funds or other  
16 property or interest vested in him or transferred to him  
17 pursuant to or with respect to the Trading with the Enemy  
18 Act of October 6, 1917, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.),  
19 necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the powers and  
20 duties conferred on the Attorney General pursuant to said  
21 Act: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,600,000 shall be  
22 available in the current fiscal year for the general adminis-  
23 trative expenses of the Office of Alien Property, including  
24 rent of private or Government-owned space in the District

1 of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed one passenger  
2 motor vehicle for replacement only; and expenses of at-  
3 tendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the  
4 purposes of this authorization: *Provided further*, That on  
5 or before November 1 of the current fiscal year, the At-  
6 torney General shall make a report to the Appropriations  
7 Committees of the Senate and the House of Representa-  
8 tives giving detailed information on all administrative  
9 and nonadministrative expenses incurred during the next  
10 preceding fiscal year in connection with the activities of the  
11 Office of Alien Property: *Provided further*, That of the  
12 total amount herein authorized the amount of \$100,000 is  
13 to be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and  
14 expenses, general administration", Department of Justice.

15 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

16 SEC. 202. Not to exceed \$350,000 in the aggregate  
17 from the appropriations made in this title for general ad-  
18 ministration, general legal activities, and United States at-  
19 torneys and marshals shall be available, without regard to  
20 the Classification Act of 1949, for compensation (not to  
21 exceed \$11,000 per annum) of special attorneys and special  
22 assistants to the Attorney General and to United States  
23 attorneys not otherwise provided for: *Provided*, That re-  
24 ports be submitted to the Congress on the 1st of July and  
25 January showing the names of the persons employed under

1 the foregoing limitation, the annual rate of compensation  
2 or amount of any fee paid to each, together with a descrip-  
3 tion of their duties.

4 SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated by this title  
5 may be used to pay the compensation of any person here-  
6 after employed as an attorney (except foreign counsel em-  
7 ployed in special cases) unless such person shall be duly  
8 licensed and authorized to practice as an attorney under  
9 the laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

10 SEC. 204. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the  
11 offices of the United States attorney and the United States  
12 marshal for the District of Columbia from all appropriations  
13 in this title shall be reimbursed to the United States from  
14 any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit  
15 of the District of Columbia.

16 SEC. 205. Appropriations and authorizations made in  
17 this title which are available for expenses of attendance at  
18 meetings shall be expended for such purposes in accordance  
19 with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General.

20 SEC. 206. Appropriations and authorizations made in  
21 this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for  
22 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
23 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

24 This title may be cited as the "Department of Justice  
25 Appropriation Act, 1952".



## 1 TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## 2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the  
4 Office of the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this  
5 title referred to as the Secretary) including services as  
6 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
7 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per  
8 diem; and teletype news service (not exceeding \$1,000);  
9 \$1,500,000.

10 Technical and scientific services: For expenses neces-  
11 sary for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and  
12 engineering information to business and industry as author-  
13 ized by the Act of September 9, 1950 (Public Law 776),  
14 including not to exceed \$2,000 for services as authorized  
15 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.  
16 55a), \$250,000: *Provided*, That moneys hereafter received  
17 by the Secretary pursuant to section 3 of said Act of Sep-  
18 tember 9, 1950, for publications provided thereunder, shall  
19 be available for reimbursing any appropriation as provided  
20 by said section.

## 21 BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

22 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Census: For ex-  
23 penses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing  
24 current census statistics provided for by law; for searching  
25 census records and supplying information with respect to age

1 and citizenship certification; and for general administration,  
2 including enumerators at rates to be fixed without regard  
3 to the Classification Act of 1949; and services as authorized  
4 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),  
5 at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem;  
6 \$7,100,000.

7       Seventeenth decennial census: For expenses necessary  
8 for taking, compiling, and publishing the seventeenth decen-  
9 nial census including the census of housing as authorized by  
10 law (13 U. S. C. 201-219; 42 U. S. C. 1442), including  
11 personal services at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of  
12 Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949;  
13 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
14 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and compensation of employees  
15 of the Department of Commerce and other departments and  
16 independent establishments of the Government who may be  
17 detailed for field work; \$7,000,000, to remain available until  
18 December 31, 1952, and to be merged with the appropriation  
19 made under this head in the Department of Commerce Ap-  
20 propriation Act 1951.

21       Censuses of business, transportation, manufactures and  
22 mineral industries: For expenses necessary to prepare for  
23 taking, compiling, and publishing the censuses of business,  
24 transportation, manufactures and mineral industries as  
25 authorized by law, including personal services by contract or

1 otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce  
2 without regard to the Classification Act of 1949; services as  
3 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
4 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per  
5 diem; and additional compensation of Federal employees tem-  
6 porarily detailed for field work under this appropriation;  
7 \$200,000, to remain available until December 31, 1953.

8 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

9 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the  
10 Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the pro-  
11 visions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended  
12 (49 U. S. C. 401), the Act of August 8, 1950 (Public  
13 Law 670), and other Acts incident to the enforcement of  
14 safety regulations; maintenance and operation of air naviga-  
15 tion facilities and air traffic control; furnishing advisory serv-  
16 ice to States and other public and private agencies in con-  
17 nection with the construction or improvement of airports  
18 and landing areas; and the disposal of surplus airports; in-  
19 cluding hire of aircraft (not exceeding \$395,000); the  
20 operation and maintenance of eighty-five aircraft; contract  
21 stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of expert  
22 and other witnesses; examination of estimates of appropri-  
23 ations in the field; purchase (not to exceed twenty, for re-  
24 placement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and  
25 purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; \$99,100,000,



1 and the Departments of the Air Force, Army and  
2 Navy are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics  
3 Administration without charge, subject to the approval of  
4 the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement only),  
5 aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment, and hangar, line,  
6 and shop equipment surplus to the needs of such Depart-  
7 ments: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appro-  
8 priation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities,  
9 and other public authorities for expenses incurred in the  
10 maintenance and operation of airport traffic control towers.

11 Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the ac-  
12 quisition and establishment by contract or purchase and hire  
13 of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of addi-  
14 tional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction  
15 of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling  
16 and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration  
17 and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; the  
18 acquisition of the necessary sites by lease, condemnation or  
19 grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related  
20 accommodations for officers and employees of the Civil Aero-  
21 nautics Administration and the Weather Bureau stationed at  
22 remote localities not on foreign soil where such accommoda-  
23 tions are not otherwise available; hire of passenger motor  
24 vehicles; and not to exceed \$200,000 for emergency repairs  
25 and replacement of facilities damaged by fire, flood, or storm;



1 to remain available until expended, \$20,000,000, of which  
2 \$12,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred  
3 under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for  
4 the foregoing purposes: *Provided*, That authority hereto-  
5 fore granted under this head to enter into contracts for such  
6 purposes may be exercised until June 30, 1952 and may  
7 hereafter be accounted for under this head: *Provided further*,  
8 That the consolidated appropriation under this head for the  
9 next preceding fiscal year is hereby consolidated with and  
10 made a part of this appropriation to be disbursed and ac-  
11 counted for as one fund: *Provided further*, That transfers may  
12 be made from this appropriation to the appropriation "Sal-  
13 aries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration", for  
14 costs of maintenance and operation of aircraft for initial flight  
15 checking of facilities established under this appropriation (not  
16 to exceed \$325,000) ; for necessary expenses in connection  
17 with the transportation by air to and from and within the  
18 Territories of the United States of materials and equipment  
19 secured under this appropriation (not to exceed \$115,000) ;  
20 and for necessary administrative costs (not to exceed \$325,-  
21 000) : *Provided further*, That the Departments of the Army,  
22 Navy, and Air Force are authorized during the current fiscal  
23 year to transfer without charge, subject to the approval of  
24 the Bureau of the Budget, air-navigation and communication

1 facilities, including appurtenances thereto, to the Civil Aero-  
2 nautics Administration.

3     Technical development and evaluation: For expenses  
4 necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aero-  
5 nautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), relative  
6 to such developmental work and service testing as tends to  
7 the creation of improved air-navigation facilities, including  
8 landing areas, aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances,  
9 personnel, and operation methods; acquisition of necessary  
10 sites by lease or grant; and operation and maintenance of five  
11 aircraft, which shall be in addition to the number authorized  
12 herein under the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses,  
13 Civil Aeronautics Administration"; \$1,200,000.

14     Maintenance and operation, Washington National Air-  
15 port: For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-  
16 nance, and protection of the Washington National Airport,  
17 including purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for re-  
18 placement only; not to exceed \$3,500 for the purchase,  
19 cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition;  
20 \$1,300,000.

21     Construction, Washington National Airport: For an  
22 additional amount for construction at the Washington Na-  
23 tional Airport, \$75,000, to remain available until expended.

1 Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For  
2 carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of  
3 May 13, 1946, as amended (except section 5 (a) ), to be  
4 available until June 30, 1954, \$35,840,000, of which (1)  
5 \$17,000,000 shall be for projects in the States in accordance  
6 with section 6 of said Act, (2) \$470,000 for projects in  
7 Puerto Rico, (3) \$30,000 for projects in the Virgin Islands,  
8 (4) \$300,000 for projects in the Territory of Hawaii, (5)  
9 \$200,000 for projects in the Territory of Alaska, (6)  
10 \$15,000,000 for liquidation of obligations incurred under  
11 authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the  
12 foregoing purposes and (7) \$2,840,000 shall be available  
13 as one fund for necessary planning, research, and adminis-  
14 trative expenses; including hire of passenger motor vehicles;  
15 of which \$2,840,000 not to exceed \$500,000 may be trans-  
16 ferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil  
17 Aeronautics Administration", to provide for necessary ad-  
18 ministrative expenses, including the maintenance and opera-  
19 tion of aircraft: *Provided*, That the appropriation under this  
20 head for the next preceding fiscal year is hereby merged  
21 with this appropriation and the contract authorization here-  
22 tofore granted for the foregoing purposes may hereafter be  
23 accounted for under this head.

24 Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory



1 of Alaska: For expenses necessary for the maintenance, im-  
2 provement, and operation of public airports in the Territory  
3 of Alaska, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 485 c-h);  
4 including arms and ammunition; \$225,000.

5 Air navigation development: For liquidation of obliga-  
6 tions incurred under authority heretofore granted under this  
7 head to enter into contracts, \$1,883,000: *Provided*, That  
8 the appropriation granted under this head for the fiscal year  
9 1951 shall remain available during the current fiscal year  
10 and may hereafter be accounted for under this head, and not  
11 to exceed \$80,000 of such appropriation shall be available  
12 for administrative expenses.

13 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

14 Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses: For  
15 necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including  
16 contract stenographic reporting services; employment of tem-  
17 porary guards on a contract or fee basis; salaries and traveling  
18 expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training  
19 conducted by the Government or industries serving aviation;  
20 expenses of examination of estimates of appropriations in the  
21 field; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and hire, operation,  
22 maintenance, and repair of aircraft; \$3,550,000: *Provided*,  
23 That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are  
24 authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Board without



1 charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,  
2 aircraft (for replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, and  
3 accessories surplus to the needs of such Departments.

4 COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry  
6 out the provisions of the Act of August 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C.  
7 883a-883i), including purchase of not to exceed four pas-  
8 senger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of sites and  
9 the erection of temporary buildings for tide, magnetic or  
10 seismological observations; hire of aircraft; operation,  
11 maintenance, and repair of an airplane; extra compensation  
12 at not to exceed \$15 per month to each member of the  
13 crew of a vessel when assigned duties as recorder or instru-  
14 ment observer, and at not to exceed \$1 per day for each  
15 station to employees of other Federal agencies while making  
16 oceanographic observations or tending seismographs; not to  
17 exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of  
18 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; pay, allow-  
19 ances, gratuities, transportation of dependents and house-  
20 hold effects, and payment of funeral expenses, as authorized  
21 by law, for not to exceed 185 commissioned officers on the  
22 active list; and pay of commissioned officers retired in ac-  
23 cordance with law; \$12,375,000: *Provided*, That the Depart-  
24 ments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized  
25 during the current fiscal year to transfer without reimburse-

1 ment to the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to the  
2 approval of the Bureau of the Budget, landing craft, launches,  
3 marine engines, electronic equipment, automotive vehicles,  
4 parts, equipment, and supplies, excess to the needs of such  
5 Departments, which will serve to expedite surveys in Alaska  
6 for national defense: *Provided further*, That during the  
7 current fiscal year, this appropriation shall be reimbursed  
8 (to the extent and in the manner required by law (44  
9 U. S. C. 246) for charts sold to the general public) for  
10 charts published by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and  
11 furnished for the official use of the military departments of  
12 the Department of Defense.

13 BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

14 Departmental salaries and expenses: For necessary  
15 expenses of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce  
16 at the seat of government, including the purchase of com-  
17 mercial and trade reports, and not to exceed \$50,000 for  
18 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
19 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That  
20 expenses of field studies or surveys conducted by depart-  
21 mental personnel of the Bureau shall be payable from the  
22 amount herein appropriated.

23 Field office service: For expenses necessary to operate  
24 and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices

1 for the collection and dissemination of information useful in  
2 the development and improvement of commerce throughout  
3 the United States and its possessions, including not to exceed  
4 \$90,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,  
5 \$1,900,000.

6 Export control: For expenses necessary for carrying  
7 out the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949, as  
8 amended, relating to export controls, including services as  
9 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
10 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem  
11 for individuals, \$5,500,000, of which not to exceed  
12 \$1,277,000 may be transferred to the Bureau of Customs,  
13 Treasury Department, for enforcement of the export con-  
14 trol program, and of which not to exceed \$100,000 may be  
15 transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses"  
16 under the Office of the Secretary.

17 PATENT OFFICE

18 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-  
19 ing services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
20 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to  
21 exceed \$75 per diem (not to exceed \$25,000); expenses of  
22 transporting to foreign governments publications of patents  
23 issued by the Patent Office; defense of suits instituted against  
24 the Commissioner of Patents; and other contingent expenses  
25 of the Patent Office: *Provided*, That the headings of the

1 drawings for patented cases may be multigraphed in the  
2 Patent Office for the purpose of photolithography, \$11,-  
3 500,000.

4 BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

5 General administrative expenses: Necessary expenses of  
6 administration, including advertising (including advertising  
7 in the city of Washington for work to be performed in areas  
8 adjacent thereto), purchase of fifty passenger motor vehicles  
9 for replacement only, and the maintenance and repairs of  
10 experimental highways, shall be paid, in accordance with  
11 law, from appropriations available to the Bureau of Public  
12 Roads.

13 Of the total amount available from appropriations of  
14 the Bureau of Public Roads for general administrative ex-  
15 penses, pursuant to the provisions of section 21 of the Act  
16 of November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 21),  
17 \$100,000 shall be available for all necessary expenses to  
18 enable the President to utilize the services of the Bureau of  
19 Public Roads in fulfilling the obligations of the United  
20 States under the Convention on the Pan-American High-  
21 way Between the United States and Other American Re-  
22 publics (51 Stat. 152), cooperation with several govern-  
23 ments, members of the Pan American Union, in connection  
24 with the survey and construction of the Inter-American  
25 Highway, and for performing engineering service in Pan-



1 American countries for and upon the request of any agency  
2 or governmental corporation of the United States.

3 Federal-aid highways: For carrying out the provisions  
4 of the Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented  
5 (23 U. S. C. 1-22, 24-105, 107-117), to remain available  
6 until expended, \$325,000,000, which sum is composed of  
7 \$320,000,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appro-  
8 priated for the fiscal year 1950, and \$3,214,713 and  
9 \$1,785,287, the latter sums being for reimbursement of the  
10 sums expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways  
11 and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by  
12 floods, hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by section 4  
13 of the Act approved June 8, 1938, and section 7 of the Act  
14 approved July 13, 1943 (23 U. S. C. 13a and 13b).

15 Elimination of grade crossings: For the elimination  
16 of hazards to life at railroad grade crossings, to remain  
17 available until expended, \$3,000,000, which sum is a part  
18 of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal  
19 year 1943 by section 5 of the Act approved September 5,  
20 1940 (54 Stat. 869) : *Provided*, That the amounts author-  
21 ized for the elimination of grade crossing hazards by said  
22 section and apportioned to Hawaii are hereby reduced by  
23 \$188,075.

24 Forest highways: For expenses, not otherwise provided  
25 for, necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23

1 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as  
2 amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), to remain available  
3 until expended, \$21,000,000, which sum is composed of  
4 \$2,400,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be  
5 appropriated for the fiscal year 1950, and \$18,600,000, a  
6 part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal  
7 year 1951: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be avail-  
8 able for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of  
9 buildings and sites necessary for the storage and repair of  
10 equipment and supplies used for road construction and main-  
11 tenance, but the total cost of any such item under this author-  
12 ization shall not exceed \$15,000.

13 Tongass Forest Highways, Alaska: For surveys, con-  
14 struction, reconstruction, and maintenance of Tongass forest  
15 highways in Alaska in accordance with the provisions of  
16 section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, \$3,500,-  
17 000, to remain available until expended.

18 Access roads: During the current fiscal year, not to  
19 exceed \$70,000 of funds remaining unexpended upon com-  
20 pletion of access road projects authorized to be constructed  
21 under the provisions of the Defense Highway Act of 1941,  
22 as amended by the Act of July 2, 1942 (23 U. S. C. 106),  
23 shall be available for the maintenance of roads and bridges  
24 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Roads on  
25 Government-owned land in Arlington County, Virginia.

1 War and emergency damage, Territory of Hawaii:  
2 For the liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to  
3 authority granted under this head in the Independent Offices  
4 Appropriation Act, 1948, \$2,000,000, to remain available  
5 until expended.

6 Inter-American Highway: For necessary expenses of  
7 continuing the survey and construction of the Inter-American  
8 Highway, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of  
9 December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section  
10 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, \$4,000,000,  
11 to remain available until expended.

12 Access roads (Act of September 7, 1950): For an  
13 additional amount for "Access roads (Act of September 7,  
14 1950)", \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

15 General provisions—Bureau of Public Roads: None of  
16 the money appropriated for the work of the Bureau of Public  
17 Roads during the current fiscal year shall be paid to any  
18 State on account of any project on which convict labor shall  
19 be employed, but this provision shall not apply to labor  
20 performed by convicts on parole or probation.

21 During the current fiscal year authorized engineering or  
22 other services in connection with the survey, construction,  
23 and maintenance, or improvement of roads may be per-  
24 formed for other Government agencies, cooperating foreign

1 countries and State cooperating agencies and reimbursement  
2 for such services (which may include depreciation on engi-  
3 neering and road-building equipment used) shall be credited  
4 to the appropriation concerned.

5 During the current fiscal year appropriations for the  
6 work of the Bureau of Public Roads shall be available for  
7 expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement,  
8 care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment  
9 for distribution to projects under the supervision of the  
10 Bureau of Public Roads, or for sale or distribution to other  
11 Government activities, cooperating foreign countries and  
12 State cooperating agencies, and the cost of such supplies  
13 and materials or the value of such equipment (including the  
14 cost of transportation and handling) may be reimbursed to  
15 current applicable appropriations.

16 Appropriations to the Bureau of Public Roads may be  
17 used in emergency for medical supplies and services and  
18 other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of em-  
19 ployees engaged on hazardous work under that Bureau, and  
20 for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the  
21 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates for  
22 individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem.

23 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

24 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions



1 of the Act approved March 3, 1901, as amended (15  
2 U. S. C. 271-278; Public Law 619, approved July 22,  
3 1950), including not to exceed \$700,000 for improvements  
4 to buildings, grounds, and other plant facilities, as author-  
5 ized by section 2 of the Act of July 21, 1950 (Public  
6 Law 618); building of temporary experimental structures;  
7 purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for  
8 replacement only; and not to exceed \$100,000 for services  
9 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
10 (5 U. S. C. 55a); as follows:

11       Operation and administration: For the general opera-  
12 tion and administration of the Bureau; improvement and  
13 care of the grounds; plant equipment; and maintenance and  
14 protection of buildings, including repairs and alterations  
15 thereto; \$1,100,000.

16       Research and testing: For research, testing and other  
17 activities, as authorized by the Act of July 22, 1950 (Public  
18 Law 619), and not otherwise provided for, \$4,000,000.

19       Radio propagation and standards: For development and  
20 maintenance of primary standards of measurement of elec-  
21 trical quantities at radio frequencies; calibrating and certify-  
22 ing radio measuring instruments, apparatus, and standards in  
23 terms of the national primary standards; investigation of the  
24 phenomena affecting the propagation of radio waves; and

1 the broadcasting of radio signals of standard frequency;  
2 \$2,800,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year  
3 the maximum base rate of compensation for employees  
4 appointed pursuant to the Act of July 21, 1950 (Public  
5 Law 618), shall be \$6,400 per annum: *Provided further*,  
6 That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force  
7 are authorized, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the  
8 Budget, to transfer without charge to the National Bureau  
9 of Standards materials, equipment, and supplies, surplus to  
10 their needs and necessary for the establishment, maintenance,  
11 and operation of Arctic ionosphere observation  
12 stations.

13 Construction of laboratories: For payment of obligations  
14 incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head  
15 in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1951,  
16 \$3,800,000, to remain available until expended.

17 Working capital fund: For an additional amount for  
18 the "Working capital fund", established by the Deficiency  
19 Appropriation Act, 1950, \$2,000,000, to be available without  
20 fiscal year limitation.

21 WEATHER BUREAU

22 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
23 Weather Bureau, including maintenance and operation of air-

1 craft; not to exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized by  
2 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;  
3 not to exceed \$10,000 for maintenance of a printing office in  
4 the City of Washington, as authorized by law; and not to  
5 exceed \$10,000 for the United States contribution to the  
6 cost of the secretariat of the International Meteorological  
7 Committee; \$26,000,000: *Provided*, That during the current  
8 fiscal year, the maximum amount authorized under section 3  
9 (a) of the Act of June 2, 1948 (15 U. S. C. 327) , for extra  
10 compensation to employees of other Government agencies  
11 for taking and transmitting meteorological observations, shall  
12 be \$5 per day; and the maximum base rate of pay authorized  
13 under section 3 (b) of said Act, for employees conducting  
14 meteorological investigations in the Arctic region, shall be  
15 \$5,000 per annum, except that not more than five of such  
16 employees at any one time may receive a base rate of \$7,500  
17 per annum, and such employees may be appointed without  
18 regard to the Classification Act of 1949: *Provided further*,  
19 That such sums, as may be determined by the Director of  
20 the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary, may be transferred  
21 from this appropriation to the appropriation to the Depart-  
22 ment of State for "Contributions to International Organi-  
23 zations, 1952", for contribution to the International Civil

1 Aviation Organization for the United States share of the  
2 costs of the meteorological installation in Iceland, when said  
3 installation is transferred for operation under the "Agree-  
4 ment on Air Navigation Services in Iceland".

5 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

6 SEC. 302. During the current fiscal year applicable ap-  
7 propriations and funds available to the Department of Com-  
8 merce shall be available for the activities specified in the  
9 Act of October 26, 1949 (Public Law 390), to the extent  
10 and in the manner prescribed by said Act.

11 SEC. 303. Appropriations of the Department of Com-  
12 merce available for salaries and expenses shall be avail-  
13 able for attendance at meetings of organizations concerned  
14 with the activities for which the appropriations are made.

15 SEC. 304. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6  
16 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the  
17 provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce  
18 may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal  
19 year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee  
20 of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem  
21 such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests  
22 of the United States.

23 This title may be cited as the "Department of Commerce  
24 Appropriation Act, 1952".



## 1 TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

## 2 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

## 3 SALARIES

4 For the Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices, and  
5 all other officers and employees, whose compensation shall  
6 be fixed by the Court, except as otherwise provided by law,  
7 and who may be employed and assigned by the Chief Justice  
8 to any office or work of the Court, \$928,000.

## 9 PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

10 For printing and binding the advance opinions, prelimi-  
11 nary prints, and bound reports of the Court, \$91,200.

## 12 MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

13 For miscellaneous expenses to be expended as the Chief  
14 Justice may approve, \$58,350.

## 15 CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

16 For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the  
17 Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed upon  
18 him by the Act approved May 7, 1934 (40 U. S. C.  
19 13a-13d), including improvements, maintenance, repairs,  
20 equipment, supplies, materials, and appurtenances; special  
21 clothing for workmen; and personal and other services  
22 (including temporary labor without reference to the Classi-  
23 fication and Retirement Acts, as amended), and for snow  
24 removal by hire of men and equipment or under contract  
25 without compliance with sections 3709, as amended, and

1 3744 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5, 16) ;  
2 \$160,700.

3 COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges, and  
6 all other officers and employees of the court, and necessary  
7 expenses of the court, including exchange of books, and  
8 traveling expenses, as may be approved by the chief judge,  
9 \$194,500.

10 CUSTOMS COURT

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For salaries of the chief judge, eight judges, and all other  
13 officers and employees of the court, and necessary expenses  
14 of the court, including exchange of books, and traveling  
15 expenses, as may be approved by the chief judge, \$433,165:  
16 *Provided*, That traveling expenses of judges of the Customs  
17 Court shall be paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

18 COURT OF CLAIMS

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges,  
21 seven regular and six additional commissioners, and all other  
22 officers and employees of the court, and for other necessary  
23 expenses, including stenographic and other fees and charges  
24 necessary in the taking of testimony, and travel, \$579,800.

## 1 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS

2 For necessary repairs and improvements to the Court  
3 of Claims buildings, to be expended under the supervision  
4 of the Architect of the Capitol, \$9,100.

## 5 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

## 6 HAWAII

7 For salaries of the chief justice and two associate justices  
8 of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, of judges  
9 of the circuit courts in Hawaii, and of judges retired under  
10 title 28, United States Code, section 373, \$120,000.

11 SALARIES OF JUDGES

For salaries of circuit judges; district judges (including judges of the district courts of Alaska, the Virgin Islands, the Panama Canal Zone, and Guam); and justices and judges retired or resigned under title 28, United States Code, sections 371, 372, and 373; \$5,120,000.

## 17 SALARIES OF CLERKS OF COURTS

18 For salaries of clerks of United States courts of appeals  
19 and United States district courts, their deputies, and other  
20 assistants, \$4,520,000.

## 21 PROBATION SYSTEM

22 For salaries of probation officers and their clerical as-  
23 sistants, as authorized by title 18, United States Code,  
24 sections 3654 and 3656, \$2,180,000: *Provided, That*  
25 nothing herein contained shall be construed to abridge

1 the right of the district judges to appoint probation  
2 officers, or to make such orders as may be necessary to  
3 govern probation officers in their own courts: *Provided*  
4 *further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used  
5 to pay the salary or expenses of any probation officer who,  
6 in the judgment of the chief or presiding judge certified to  
7 the Attorney General, fails to carry out the official orders  
8 of the Attorney General with respect to supervising or fur-  
9 nishing information concerning any prisoner released con-  
10 ditionally or on parole from any Federal penal or correctional  
11 institution.

#### 12 SALARIES OF CRIERS

13 For salaries of criers as authorized by title 28, United  
14 States Code, sections 713 (a) and 755, \$542,300.

#### 15 FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

16 For fees of the United States commissioners and other  
17 committing magistrates acting under title 18, United States  
18 Code, section 3041, including fees and expenses of concili-  
19 ation commissioners, United States courts, including the  
20 objects and subject to the conditions specified for such fees  
21 and expenses of conciliation commissioners in the Depart-  
22 ment of Justice Appropriation Act, 1937, \$543,000.

#### 23 FEES OF JURORS

24 For fees, expenses, and costs of jurors; meals and lodging  
25 for jurors in Alaska, as provided by section 193, title II, of



1 the Act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 362) ; and compensation  
2 for jury commissioners; \$2,800,000: *Provided*, That the  
3 compensation of jury commissioners for the District of  
4 Columbia shall conform to the provisions of section 1401,  
5 title 11 of the District of Columbia Code.

6 MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

7 For salaries of all officials and employees of the  
8 Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for,  
9 \$2,670,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secre-  
10 taries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall  
11 be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office  
12 without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, except  
13 that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the  
14 General Schedule grades (GS) 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, as the ap-  
15 pointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk  
16 shall conform with that of the General Schedule grades  
17 (GS) 5, 7, 9, 11, or 12, as the appointing judge shall deter-  
18 mine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit  
19 if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge  
20 otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of  
21 step-increases corresponding with those provided for by title  
22 VII of the Classification Act of 1949 and of compensation  
23 paid for temporary assistance needed because of an emer-  
24 gency) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law

1 clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed \$9,600 per  
2 annum, except in the case of the chief judge of each circuit  
3 and the chief judge of each district court having five or more  
4 district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not  
5 exceed \$13,050 per annum.

#### 6 MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

7 For miscellaneous expenses of the United States courts  
8 and their officers; rent in the District of Columbia; pur-  
9 chase of firearms and ammunition; and purchase of en-  
10 velopes without regard to the Act of June 26, 1906 (34  
11 Stat. 476) ; \$750,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation  
12 shall be available for payment of the cost of contract statis-  
13 tical services for the Office of Register of Wills of the District  
14 of Columbia: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000  
15 of this appropriation shall be available for the payment of  
16 fees to attorneys appointed in accordance with the Act of  
17 June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 625) , not exceeding \$25 in any one  
18 case.

#### 19 TRAVEL EXPENSES

20 For necessary traveling expenses, not otherwise provided  
21 for, incurred by the Judiciary, including traveling expenses  
22 of probation officers and their clerks, \$715,000: *Provided*,  
23 That this sum shall be available, in an amount not to exceed  
24 \$8,500, for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned

1 with the work of Federal probation when incurred on the  
2 written authorization of the Director of the Administrative  
3 Office of the United States Courts.

4 SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

5 For salaries of court reporters for the district courts of  
6 the United States, as authorized by title 28, United States  
7 Code, section 753, \$988,200.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

9 For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of  
10 the United States Courts, including travel, advertising, rent  
11 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and examination  
12 of estimates for appropriations in the field, \$535,000.

13 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, DISTRICT COURT OF THE  
14 UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

15 For repairs and improvements to the courthouse, includ-  
16 ing repair and maintenance of the mechanical equipment,  
17 and for labor and material and every item incident thereto,  
18 \$7,100, to be expended under the direction of the Architect  
19 of the Capitol.

20 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, UNITED STATES COURT OF  
21 APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

22 For repairs and improvements to the United States  
23 Court of Appeals Building, including repair and maintenance  
24 of the mechanical equipment and for labor and material

1 and every item incident thereto, \$3,700, to be expended  
2 under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

3 SALARIES OF REFEREES

4 For salaries of referees as authorized by the Act of  
5 June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68), \$879,000 to be derived  
6 from the referees' salary fund established in pursuance of  
7 said Act.

8 EXPENSES OF REFEREES

9 For miscellaneous expenses of referees, United States  
10 courts, including the salaries of their clerical assistants,  
11 travel, purchase of envelopes without regard to the Act of  
12 June 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 476), \$1,090,000 to be derived  
13 from the referees' expense fund established in pursuance of  
14 the Act of June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68 (c) (4)).

15 GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

16 SEC. 402. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the  
17 District Court of the United States for the District of  
18 Columbia from all appropriations under this title and 30 per  
19 centum of the expenditures for the United States Court of  
20 Appeals for the District of Columbia from all appropriations  
21 under this title shall be reimbursed to the United States  
22 from any funds in the Treasury to the credit of the District  
23 of Columbia.

24 SEC. 403. The reports of the United States Court of



1 Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not be sold for a  
2 price exceeding that approved by the court and for not more  
3 than \$6.50 per volume.

4 This title may be cited as the "Judiciary Appropriation  
5 Act, 1952".

6 TITLE V—FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES,  
7 INCORPORATED

8 The following corporation is hereby authorized to make  
9 such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing  
10 authority available to such corporation, and in accord with  
11 law, and to make such contracts and commitments without  
12 regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104  
13 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as  
14 may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in  
15 the Budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation,  
16 except as hereinafter provided:

17 Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated: Not to exceed  
18 \$327,000 of the funds of the Corporation shall be available  
19 for its administrative expenses, and not to exceed \$404,-  
20 000 for the expenses of vocational training of prisoners,  
21 both amounts to be computed on an accrual basis and  
22 to be determined in accordance with the Corporation's  
23 prescribed accounting system in effect on July 1, 1946, and  
24 shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, expend-  
25 itures which the said accounting system requires to be capi-

1 talized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or pro-  
2 duced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses  
3 in connection with acquisition, construction, operation,  
4 maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of  
5 facilities and other property belonging to the Corporation or  
6 in which it has an interest.

## 7 TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

8 SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in  
9 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-  
10 poration included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary  
11 or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the  
12 Government of the United States or who is a member of an  
13 organization of Government employees that asserts the right  
14 to strike against the Government of the United States, or who  
15 advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,  
16 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by  
17 force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an  
18 affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the  
19 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions  
20 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of  
21 the United States, is not a member of an organization of  
22 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against  
23 the Government of the United States, or that such person  
24 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization  
25 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the

1 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That  
2 any person who engages in a strike against the Government  
3 of the United States or who is a member of an organization  
4 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike  
5 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-  
6 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,  
7 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by  
8 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or  
9 wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund  
10 contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon  
11 conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned  
12 for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That  
13 the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in  
14 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

15 This Act may be cited as the "Departments of State,  
16 Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act,  
17 1952".

# INDEX

## TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

|                                                                        | Page |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| American sections, international commissions-----                      | 10   |
| Buildings fund-----                                                    | 4    |
| Contributions to international organizations-----                      | 5    |
| Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service-----                | 5    |
| General provisions-----                                                | 16   |
| International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: |      |
| Construction-----                                                      | 9    |
| Rio Grande emergency flood protection-----                             | 10   |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                             | 9    |
| International Claims Commission-----                                   | 12   |
| International contingencies-----                                       | 7    |
| International information and educational activities-----              | 13   |
| Missions to international organizations-----                           | 6    |
| Philippine rehabilitation-----                                         | 16   |
| Representation allowances-----                                         | 4    |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                             | 2    |

## TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

|                                                                    |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Federal Bureau of Investigation:                                   |    |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                         | 20 |
| Federal Prison Industries, Inc-----                                | 56 |
| Federal Prison System:                                             |    |
| Buildings and facilities-----                                      | 24 |
| Bureau of Prisons, salaries and expenses-----                      | 23 |
| Support of United States prisoners-----                            | 25 |
| General provisions-----                                            | 26 |
| Immigration and Naturalization Service:                            |    |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                         | 22 |
| Legal Activities and General Administration:                       |    |
| Antitrust Division-----                                            | 19 |
| Claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, salaries and expenses----- | 20 |
| Fees and expenses of witnesses-----                                | 20 |
| General administration, salaries and expenses-----                 | 18 |
| General legal activities, salaries and expenses-----               | 19 |
| United States attorneys and marshals, salaries and expenses-----   | 19 |
| Office of Alien Property-----                                      | 25 |



## TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

|                                                                                 | Page |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Census, Bureau of:                                                              |      |
| Censuses of business, transportation, manufactures, and mineral industries..... | 29   |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                                      | 28   |
| Seventeenth decennial census.....                                               | 29   |
| Civil Aeronautics Administration:                                               |      |
| Air-navigation development.....                                                 | 35   |
| Air-navigation facilities, establishment of.....                                | 31   |
| Alaska airports: Maintenance and operation.....                                 | 34   |
| Federal-aid airport program.....                                                | 34   |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                                      | 30   |
| Technical development and evaluation.....                                       | 33   |
| Washington National Airport:                                                    |      |
| Construction.....                                                               | 33   |
| Maintenance and operation.....                                                  | 33   |
| Civil Aeronautics Board: Salaries and expenses.....                             | 35   |
| Coast and Geodetic Survey: Salaries and expenses.....                           | 36   |
| Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Bureau of:                                       |      |
| Export control.....                                                             | 38   |
| Salaries and expenses:                                                          |      |
| Departmental.....                                                               | 37   |
| Field.....                                                                      | 37   |
| General provisions.....                                                         | 47   |
| National Bureau of Standards:                                                   |      |
| Construction of laboratories.....                                               | 45   |
| Operation and administration.....                                               | 44   |
| Radio propagation and standards.....                                            | 44   |
| Research and testing.....                                                       | 44   |
| Working capital fund.....                                                       | 45   |
| Office of the Secretary:                                                        |      |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                                      | 28   |
| Technical and scientific services.....                                          | 28   |
| Patent Office: Salaries and expenses.....                                       | 38   |
| Public Roads, Bureau of:                                                        |      |
| Access roads.....                                                               | 41   |
| Access roads (act of Sept. 7, 1950).....                                        | 42   |
| Elimination of grade crossings.....                                             | 40   |
| Federal-aid highways.....                                                       | 40   |
| Forest highways.....                                                            | 40   |
| General administrative expenses.....                                            | 39   |
| General provisions.....                                                         | 42   |
| Inter-American Highway.....                                                     | 42   |
| Tongass Forest highways, Alaska.....                                            | 41   |
| War and emergency damages, Territory of Hawaii.....                             | 42   |
| Weather Bureau: Salaries and expenses.....                                      | 45   |

## TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

|                                                                                                    |      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Court of Claims:                                                                                   | Page |
| Repairs and improvements-----                                                                      | 50   |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                                                         | 49   |
| Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: Salaries and expenses-----                                    | 49   |
| Customs Court: Salaries and expenses-----                                                          | 49   |
| General Provisions-----                                                                            | 55   |
| Other courts and services:                                                                         |      |
| Administrative Office of the United States Courts-----                                             | 54   |
| Clerks of court, salaries of-----                                                                  | 50   |
| Commissioners, fees of-----                                                                        | 51   |
| Court reporters, salaries of-----                                                                  | 54   |
| Criers, salaries of-----                                                                           | 51   |
| District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia,<br>repairs and improvements----- | 54   |
| Hawaii-----                                                                                        | 50   |
| Judges, salaries of-----                                                                           | 50   |
| Jurors, fees of-----                                                                               | 51   |
| Miscellaneous expenses-----                                                                        | 53   |
| Miscellaneous salaries-----                                                                        | 52   |
| Probation system-----                                                                              | 50   |
| Referees, expenses of-----                                                                         | 55   |
| Referees, salaries of-----                                                                         | 55   |
| Travel expenses-----                                                                               | 53   |
| United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, repairs<br>and improvements-----      | 54   |
| Supreme Court of the United States:                                                                |      |
| Buildings and grounds, care of-----                                                                | 48   |
| Miscellaneous expenses-----                                                                        | 48   |
| Printing and binding, Supreme Court Reports-----                                                   | 48   |
| Salaries-----                                                                                      | 48   |

TITLE V—FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES,  
INCORPORATED

|                                              |    |
|----------------------------------------------|----|
| Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated----- | 56 |
|----------------------------------------------|----|

## TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

|                         |    |
|-------------------------|----|
| General provisions----- | 57 |
|-------------------------|----|

82<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

**H. R. 4740**

[Report No. 685]

---

# **A BILL**

---

Making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. ROONEY

---

JULY 10, 1951

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed







## CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 4740

---

JULY 17, 1951.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

### REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 336]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 336, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.





## House Calendar No. 59

82D CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. RES. 336

[Report No. 705]

---

### IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 17, 1951

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution;  
which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

## RESOLUTION

1       *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it  
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into  
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the  
4 Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making  
5 appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Com-  
6 merce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June  
7 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and all points of order  
8 against said bill or any provision contained therein are hereby  
9 waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined  
10 to the bill and continue not to exceed six hours, to be  
11 equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking  
12 minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the



1 bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule.  
2 At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment,  
3 the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House  
4 with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the  
5 previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill  
6 and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening  
7 motion except one motion to recommit.

---

**RESOLUTION**

---

Providing for the waiving of points of order against the bill, H. R. 4740, or any provision contained in said bill, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

---

By Mr. SABATH

---

JULY 17, 1951

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be  
printed

# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 335. A resolution for consideration of H. R. 4484, a bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries; without amendment (Rept. No. 704). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 336. A resolution for consideration of H. R. 4740, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 705). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4844. A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1045, 1057, ch. 422) so as to provide for the appointment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of special policemen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4845. A bill to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 4846. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of

emergency works for the protection of Presque Isle Peninsula, Erie Harbor, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 4847. A bill to prevent subversive individuals and organizations from appearing as surety for bail in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4848. A bill to amend section 3141 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit bail, pending appeal or certiorari, after conviction of espionage, treason, sedition, or subversive activities or of conspiracy to commit any such offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Res. 331. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of horse races which utilize horses which have been shipped in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. Res. 332. Resolution calling upon the State Department to employ means to secure the release of William N. Oatis imprisoned by the Czechoslovakian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Res. 333. Resolution calling upon the State Department to employ means to secure the release of William N. Oatis, imprisoned by the Czechoslovakian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. Res. 334. Resolution calling upon the State Department to employ means to secure the release of William N. Oatis, imprisoned by the Czechoslovakian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to "going on record as favoring and in support of the immediate authori-

zation of the plan for development of water resources of the upper river basin known as the Colorado storage project and participating projects," etc.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 4849. A bill for the relief of certain Polish sailors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 4850. A bill to stay deportation proceedings on Juan Onativia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 4851. A bill for the relief of Tear Siu-Chjuang Too-kem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4852. A bill for the relief of Albert Weeks Nevers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 4853. A bill for the relief of Joseph Michael Platkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

352. By the SPEAKER: Petition of American Veterans Committee (AVC), Washington, D. C., relative to urging the enactment of a strong Defense Production Act to stop inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

353. Also, petition of Rotary Club of Mayaguez, Mayaguez, P. R., relative to the celebration of the golden jubilee of the Mayaguez Federal Experiment Station; to the Committee on Agriculture.









heading "General expenses" as reads: "deputy disbursing officer, who shall hereafter, in the absence of the disbursing officer, be authorized to transact all duties pertaining to said disbursing officer, and who shall be required to give bond to the said disbursing officer in the sum of \$25,000, conditioned on the faithful performance of the duties of his office, but said disbursing officer to be responsible to the United States, District of Columbia, and the people whom he pays, as now required by law, \$1,500;"

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AMENDING AN ACT OF JUNE 7, 1938

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 573) to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to increase the basic rate of compensation of the members of the board of barber examiners from \$9 to \$20 a day. Even though the rate is set from \$9 to \$20 a day, the rate is now actually \$13.07 because of various pay acts which have been passed from time to time. For all practical purposes the increase would then be from \$13.07 to \$20.

The bill would also require the posting of a list of prices for the various services rendered by the barber shops. The bill also changes the penalty from a minimum of \$25 to a maximum of \$200. The bill has the approval of the Board of Commissioners and Board of Barber Examiners of the District of Columbia. To carry out the provisions of this bill would require no increase in the number of employees by the Barber Board and the increased compensation would be paid by the fees as set by the Barber Board.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, this bill is another one of those bills to regulate barbers. Now, we had the foot doctors a minute ago. The barbers figure they ought to have \$20 a day for inspections instead of \$9. It also provides that they place in their shops a list of what they are going to charge for cutting hair, that is, of the people who do not have hair and those that do have hair. The board sets up some other regulations. I am just not sure how much good is in the bill. It does not cost the District anything. They do set up a \$200 fine on these barbers for violation. I rather suspect that some of them will be up before the members of the District Committee before long complaining about the treatment they have received.

In that connection, I want to make a confession, Mr. Speaker. A few years ago we passed a bill for the architects and the engineers. It was a bill not just like this, but to regulate the architects and engineers of the District. It gave them certain procedures that they could handle in the District. It set up a code of ethics. Now if you want to build a

new home you must get approval and blueprints and permits and have many many inspections.

Yes, in order to build a cement step at the kitchen door you need a blueprint and the help of an architect and engineer—the cost \$25 to \$50. It would be more than the step. In other words, in my opinion, the passage of that bill, and I am ready to have new legislation to have it repealed, has caused the people of the District of Columbia a great deal of distress and unnecessary expense.

If you want me to, I can cite some of these cases that have been called to my attention where the inspectors have come in and said, "You cannot do this. You do not have a blueprint or permit. You do not have the approval of the department." It makes your blood boil.

This is a barber's bill. I do not know; maybe the barbers need some help. Their present rate, I think they say, costs them \$13.07 a day for the inspector. They now want \$20 a day. I am not going to complain about that. But I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that before another Congress meets, some of these barbers out in the outlying districts that have a little barber shop in their home, or a small one-chair barber shop, who are doing a pretty good job taking care of the school kids and charging maybe 25 or 40 cents for a haircut per youngster, and maybe do not have the list posted in their barber shops, some of those barbers will be in your office and in the offices of the other Members, asking that something be done to give them a little relief.

I am not going to object to the consideration of the bill but here again I say in another Congress you will find some of these little barbers in here complaining about regulations.

Mr. McMILLAN. I heartily agree with the gentleman on the architects and engineers bill. I personally held the bill up in committee for 2 years.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right.

Mr. McMILLAN. However, I do not believe this bill is in exactly the same category.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 12 of the act entitled "An act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 7, 1938 (52 Stat. 622), be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 12. The Commissioners are authorized and directed to provide suitable quarters for the Board. The compensation of each member of the Board, other than the secretary-treasurer, shall be fixed by the Commissioners at not to exceed \$20 for each day actually and necessarily spent in their duties as such members: *Provided*, That the total compensation payable to each such member shall not exceed \$600 per annum. The Commissioners are also authorized and directed to appoint such clerks, inspectors, and other personnel as they deem to be necessary to assist the Board in carrying out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That such inspectors shall be qualified barbers, each of whom shall have been engaged in the practice of barbering in the District of Columbia for a period of 5 years immediately prior to their appointment and

shall be appointed after a competitive examination held for said positions by the Board. Compensation of such clerks, inspectors, and other personnel, including the secretary-treasurer of the Board, shall be fixed by the Commissioners. Payments for expenses of the Board, including those authorized by this section, shall not exceed the amount received from the fees provided for in this act; and if at the close of any fiscal year there be any funds unexpended in excess of the sum of \$1,000, such excess shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That no expense incurred under this act shall be a charge against the funds of the United States or the District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. Subsection (B) of section 14 of such act is amended by striking therefrom "not less than \$25" and inserting in lieu thereof "not more than \$200."

SEC. 3. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized by regulation to require the owner or the manager of every barber shop in the District of Columbia to post on a sign or signs the prices of services rendered to the public and they may specify in such regulations the sizes of the sign or signs, the lettering thereon, and the location thereof upon which prices are required to be posted. The Commissioners are further authorized to prescribe in such regulations that for each violation thereof there may be imposed a fine not exceeding \$200.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second month following its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXCHANGE OF LAND IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 673) to permit the exchange of land belonging to the District of Columbia for land belonging to the abutting property owner or owners, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That where two lots or parcels of land abut each other and one of such lots or parcels belongs to the District of Columbia, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, with the approval of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, are hereby authorized and empowered, when in their judgment and discretion it is for the best interest of the District of Columbia, to exchange such District-owned land, or part thereof, for the abutting lot or parcel of land, or part thereof: *Provided*, That no such exchange shall be made unless the Commissioners of said District shall, 30 days prior thereto, publish in a newspaper of general circulation in the said District a notice of their intention to make such exchange and such notice shall include a description by lot or parcel number or otherwise of all lots or parcels to be exchanged and the appraised value thereof. The said Commissioners are hereby authorized to execute a proper deed of conveyance for the land belonging to the District to be conveyed and to accept a proper deed of conveyance from the owner of such abutting real estate. If, in the opinion of the Commissioners, the value of the land to be conveyed to the District is in excess of the value



of the land to be conveyed by the District, the Commissioners are authorized to pay, within the limitation of appropriations therefor, to the abutting property owner the amount of such excess as determined by the Commissioners, on the basis of an appraisal, and, if the value of the land to be conveyed by the District is in excess of the value of the land to be conveyed to the District, the Commissioners shall require the abutting property owner to pay such excess as determined by the Commissioners, on the basis of an appraisal, as part of the consideration for the said exchange.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I dislike to take so much time when I know there is some important legislation following this, but this is important to the District.

Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to make it possible for the District to exchange some property that they may have for some other property that is abutting their property. The word "abutting" I think was not originally in the bill. They are doing it really for the purpose of building a sewage disposal plant down on the river.

I call the attention of my chairman and the House to this problem as far as the District of Columbia is concerned. The District of Columbia owns a great deal of real estate. Some of it they are using and some of it they are not using. I am thinking now of some property in Laurel that has a beautiful brick building on it built during the WPA days.

The ground covers 160 acres. To my knowledge it has never yet been used. I tried to ascertain just last week what the District of Columbia was doing with this particular property. It seems to me some committee ought to be set up to ask the District Commissioners to give to the Congress a list of real estate that they own and hold which they are not using.

We know that there is some property that they are going to buy in connection with the building of a hospital center. I think a hospital center is needed in the District. I believe now that they are going out to the old Soldiers' Home and expect to buy that for \$1,500,000 or \$2,000,000 to get started with this hospital center. They own some other real estate. This beautiful brick building that I spoke of, I think it was used about 6 months, and since that time it has gone to pieces. If that land is not needed, it ought to be sold. I understand it is very valuable property. An up-to-date list of property both in and out of the District ought to be available. There are little parcels here and there which need to be put back on the tax rolls in some way.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is probably right about various pieces of property in the District of Columbia, but this particular bill applies only to exchanges on property which abuts another piece of property.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, I think that is right. I believe the committee has fixed this bill so that they are not exchanging property except if it is

adjacent to or abuts the other property. The original intention of the bill was to make possible this exchange without the abutting features. That I thought was bad in the bill.

I also submit somewhere along the line an inventory ought to be had of the real estate that the District of Columbia now owns, which may or may not be used.

Mr. Speaker, I have no particular objection to this bill, except to say it does seem to me we ought to get a list of the real estate owned by the District of Columbia, with the view in mind of perhaps disposing of that real estate.

I do not think the District of Columbia ought to be in the business of acquiring large tracts of land, whether it is abutting that property or inside or outside of the District of Columbia.

It is a question that needs some review.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to permit the District of Columbia to exchange land which is owned by the District of Columbia for land abutting such land owned by the District of Columbia where, in the judgment of the Commissioners such exchange would be in the best interest of the District. If the parcels of land to be exchanged are of equal value the provision is made for the Commissioners to pay or to receive payments for the difference in value so as to make the exchanges fair to both parties.

Under this legislation no new employees would be required, nor would there be any additional cost except in cases where the Commissioners were required to pay additional revenue in exchange for land acquired by the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker on roll call No. 129 of July 20 I am recorded as voting "nay." At the same time the RECORD shows on page 8810 the following:

Mr. COLMER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. Speaker, there was some confusion at the time of the vote. Actually what happened was that I did vote "nay" but I immediately corrected it and voted "yea." I never appeared in the well.

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD may be corrected to indicate my true vote as "yea" on that roll call and that the words appearing on page 8810 to which I have called attention may be deleted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MORRIS). Without objection, the permanent RECORD and Journal will be so corrected.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up a resolution (H. Res. 336) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provision contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution which has just been read makes in order for consideration the bill providing appropriations for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and the Federal judiciary for the fiscal year of 1952. It provides for 6 hours of general debate. All points of order are waived against any of the provisions of the bill.

The 6 hours' general debate will give all gentlemen, who, from time to time have been criticizing the various departments, usually without justification, ample opportunity to proceed and devote some of their time in further criticizing those departments. I know there will be some gentlemen who will criticize the Secretary of State. I hold no brief for them, but I know that when the history is written it will clearly show that he was one of the greatest to serve as Secretary of State.

It has been my honor and privilege to serve with many outstanding men who have held the important position of Secretary of State. Without fear of successful contradiction, I will say that he has conducted that office as judiciously and under the most trying conditions as any other Secretary in the history of the Nation. Of course, I have not always agreed with him when he followed the advice of some of the outstanding Republicans, who I believe frequently sought to mislead him; but, with those exceptions, I think he has done splendid work, and his efforts in years to come will be acclaimed and appreciated.

I presume some gentlemen will again charge that he has some Socialists or Communists in his office. Personally, I think if a real investigation were made, we would find there would be more Fascists in the Department than there are Communists. I do not think there are any Communists at heart there. There may be some men who believe in progressive legislation, who have the interests of the country at heart, who are mistakenly labeled as "pinks" or Communists, which of course does not appeal to some of my Republican friends. Nevertheless, he has been censured and



I presume will be again in the general debate as I have said, unfairly and unjustly.

Criticism will also be directed, I presume, at the Department of Justice. Why? Because the Attorney General of that Department has started prosecutions against some of the trusts or combines which are taking advantage of the Nation and the country and its people in many ways. They are trying to bring to justice those violators of the law who, for their own enrichment, have evaded the law.

The Secretary of Commerce also may be censored. I myself might be in a position perhaps to find fault with the Secretary of Commerce, but I feel he is doing what he believes is right. I think each and every one of these men in charge of these departments is a capable, honest, sincere American, and decides to do what he believes is right for the country and for its people. But of course some people love to criticize. It is easier to tear down than to build up.

I do not desire to call attention to some of the shortcomings and misdeeds of some of the Republican officeholders in years gone by. I could justly spend half of the 6 hours in calling the attention of the American people to some of the matters passed on by Republicans in office that may be rightly questioned, of their short-sighted policies, they always having the interest of the vested interests at heart instead of the interests of the people. Mr. Speaker, in view of the 6 hours that will be allowed for general debate in which all matters contained in the bill will be discussed pro and con and fault found with and criticism made of many of its provisions, I shall conclude these remarks in order that other Members may have the opportunity to find fault again and unjustly and unfairly criticize and smear some outstanding men who are serving our country at this time.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the bill we have before us today contains \$100,000,000 for the Voice of America. I rise at this time because I want to discuss the Voice and to establish what the attitude of Republican Members of the House is on this program. I have talked with many Members, I have heard their opinions, and I have weighed their views. I do not profess to speak for every single Member, but I think the Republican position can pretty well be summed up as follows:

First. Republicans are for a program such as is envisioned by the Voice of America. It was the Republican Eightieth Congress which enacted the enabling legislation setting up the Voice of America.

Second. The overwhelming majority of Republican Members are distressed at the results which have been obtained by the operation of the Voice. They regard the idea as a sound one, but they contend the execution of the idea by the administration has been an almost complete failure.

Third. It appears to be a belief of most of my colleagues that the greatest single handicap suffered by the Voice is the fact that the administration has no foreign policy worthy of the name. There is the additional thought that even if there was a firm policy in existence, the present methods and the present personnel of the Voice would still cause the program to fail.

I want to examine the whole problem of the Voice of America today with a view to seeing what this House should do about it. We are faced with the question of whether a program that is a conceded failure should be continued at all, continued in part, or continued without any curtailment whatsoever.

Let me deal for a few minutes with what might be called an ideal propaganda program.

The first requisite for such a program would be a firm, clear-cut foreign policy. For example, suppose such a policy called for opposing communism wherever and whenever it achieves control or threatens to achieve control in any part of the world. That in itself would not be a complete foreign policy, but it certainly would be a vital element of a foreign policy—it would be a foundation, so to speak, for a comprehensive policy. It certainly would be closer to a policy than anything we have today.

Operating under such a basic premise, any information or propaganda program could then take the offensive fearlessly and without equivocation.

With such a sound foundation under this foreign policy, the administrators of the program would then feel free to establish a staff of experts on communism who would be qualified by nature of background and by previous experience in or with the Communist conspiracy to develop the correct psychological approach in the battle for the minds of men.

With anticommunism as the hard core of our policy, the propaganda program would then have a true objective. That objective would be to expose communism to the peoples of the world and to show what it has done wherever it has existed. The objective would also include assurances to the various peoples of the world that America stood ready to help them throw off the burden of communism.

It naturally follows that if we were to have such a program, we would want to employ personnel completely familiar with the characteristics peculiar to each nation to which we were addressing ourselves. It is self-evident that you do not approach the mind of a Frenchman in the same manner in which you approach the mind of a Mongolian.

The directing officials of such a program would of necessity have to be brilliant, resourceful, imaginative peo-

ple with a complete understanding of the Communist conspiracy and possessing the mental courage and know-how to fight it by propaganda and psychological warfare.

In addition, the program would have to be closely coordinated with the other operations of our Government at the policy-making level, including the military and the diplomatic branches.

It is not necessary for me to tell the House that we have no such program today, or that we are not going to have such a program until there is a drastic change in the personnel of the executive branch of our Government. Yet we are faced with the question of whether an unspeakably poor Voice of America is better than no Voice of America at all.

The fundamental disease which infects this administration is timidity, aggravated by an ailment which, for want of a better word, I will describe as reformitis.

This administration basks in the naive belief that the way to fight communism is to reform somebody. There is no comprehension of the fundamental fact that the Communist conspiracy is not based on a successful ideology, but on the use of force, terror, and untruth. There is absolutely no comprehension of the essential fact that Communists do not come into control by winning majorities; they have never won a popular election in the entire history of communism. On the contrary, they have seized power in every instance through the use of force or infiltration by a tightly-knit minority which ruthlessly destroyed lives, property, and truth to achieve control by methods no different than those employed by the Capone gang in Chicago in their heyday of infamy.

Chicago did not get rid of the Capone gangsters by passing wage-hour laws, building little TVA's, instituting land reforms, or borrowing money from Uncle Sam. The way to get rid of gangsters is to meet them head on at the scene of their crime and convict them in a court of law and in the court of public opinion.

Gangsterism does not prey on bad people and grant immunity to good people. Neither does communism. If this administration ever understands that fundamental fact, we may start winning against the world Communist conspiracy instead of suffering defeat after defeat.

Yet this administration, from top to bottom, is imbued with this reformitis and the timidity which goes with it hand in hand.

The Voice of America is headed by a young man named Edward W. Barrett, who enjoys the title of Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Mr. Barrett is probably an estimable gentleman who comes from a good family, went to a good school, and held jobs in the journalistic field which were above reproach. However that may be, the facts are that Mr. Barrett is part and parcel of this fuzzy-minded, timid cabal to which I refer.

I hold in my hand a copy of Pathfinder magazine dated December 13, 1950. The cover on this magazine is a picture of



Mr. Barrett, and the caption beneath it reads "The man with 42 voices." Within the covers of this magazine there are four pages devoted to a story about Mr. Barrett and the operations of the Voice of America which he directs. On page 21 of this issue Mr. Barrett is quoted as follows:

Today we're building the machinery for keeping the world informed, but the basis of that information must still be "acting right." If we can engineer some land reforms in southeast Asia and help promote real economic improvement, it'll be worth 20 divisions to us, or maybe 20 radio stations.

I do not know whether our troops in Korea ever read Mr. Barrett's statement in Pathfinder magazine or not, but I would say that Mr. Barrett's comprehension of how to reach the minds of men is laid bare in his words that I have just quoted.

I can imagine the psychological impact of Mr. Barrett's words on a weary, grimy, fatigued GI, knee deep in a rice paddy in Korea, facing Communist bullets, artillery fire, and aerial strafing, when he heard that a little bit of land reform would be worth 20 divisions.

I am sure any GI would have told Mr. Barrett that he would take the 20 divisions and let Mr. Barrett and this administration keep their land-reform programs.

But more important than the impact of such a fuzzy-minded concept on our troops in Korea is the fact that these words thoroughly and completely reflect the disease which infects this administration from top to bottom.

We tried land reforms, loans, wage-hour edicts, and the whole list of New Deal and Fair Deal panaceas in South Korea from 1945 until 1950. Our State Department told the world we were making South Korea "the showcase of democracy." Those were the exact words the State Department used.

We said to the South Koreans: "No, you can not have guns, even though the Soviet Union is giving your northern brothers guns, planes, and tanks. You South Koreans must be so nice and so good no one will dare attack you. You will be an example for the world, and when everybody sees your example, the Communist leaders all over the world will roll over dead, mortified into oblivion by the splendid example you are making."

Yes, we even pulled our troops out of South Korea in the summer of 1949, just 1 year before the shooting started. The South Koreans begged us for arms, but this administration refused to let them have them. The South Koreans were given land reform and wage-hour laws, and the North Koreans received guns and bullets. I will leave it to your judgment whether our over-all total of 150,000 casualties in the current Korean conflict are sufficient evidence that our dreamboat policy in South Korea was incredibly stupid.

And yet, 6 months after the Korean War had started, Mr. Edward W. Barrett, who runs the Voice of America, was still prating about land reforms in southeast Asia being worth more than 20 divisions.

God help us.

Now let me read more from this incredible Mr. Barrett, who seems to have trouble deciding whether land reforms are worth more than 20 divisions or more than 20 radio stations. He goes on to say in the interview in Pathfinder magazine:

That's why I'm pretty happy about the psychological strategy board. It's composed of the top men from the Joint Chiefs, Defense, ECA, Central Intelligence, National Security Resources Board, and State, with me as chairman. Meets once a week, usually. The next one will be over at my house, where we can take off our coats and tackle the real problems of planning coordinated programs overseas so we get the maximum impact on the most people.

Down through the New Deal and Fair Deal years I have heard a great deal about the brain-trust salons, the intellectual soirees, and the pink-teacup conclaves of the mental giants of the administration in Washington. We are told it is at these affairs where all the advanced thinking is done and the master plans are made.

For 30 years we have been hearing a great deal about smoke-filled rooms at political conventions, but I want to say to this House that the fundamental institutions of America have undergone a thousand times greater damage from the intellectual soirees in the fog-filled rooms of Washington during these last 18 years.

There is something just too precious about these cozy little meetings at the homes of members of this psychological strategy board, whatever that is. What these gentlemen had better do is put on their coats and get out of Washington before they have completely wrecked this great country of ours with their foggy, vaporous thinking.

I have made considerable study of the operations of the Voice of America, as have many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, and I am distressed that the Voice of America has accomplished so little and failed so often.

I have received many comments, both good and bad, about the Voice of America. I have received letters from many parts of the world telling me of the effect or the lack thereof of the Voice in the writer's particular country. I have discussed the Voice with numerous high officials of various governments, including our own Government.

The consensus of opinion is that the best thing which can be said about the Voice of America is that it is incredibly dull and boring. It is without imagination. It wanders aimlessly from program to program. It lacks a cohesive idea or ideas. No one is sure exactly what it is trying to do. Only a mere handful profess to see any good coming from it as it now operates.

I shall not attempt here today to array all the facts I have in my possession concerning the Voice of America. I know that others will take the floor to cover many of the points I could make. Therefore, I shall cite only a few examples of the low opinion in which the Voice is held wherever you check anywhere in the world.

The chief criticism—and it is almost uniformly mentioned wherever Americans travel—is that the peoples of the world are fed up with being told how great America is. They are sick of seeing endless State Department propaganda picture books crammed full with fat and jolly American faces. The peoples of the world are already very much aware that we think very highly of ourselves, for very few of them have escaped the experience of encountering American travelers who swaggered and boasted as they traveled.

From what I can deduce, most Europeans and Asiatics are not so much interested in our own material success as they are concerned with what Uncle Sam is going to do about the threat of communism. And need I add that the Voice seldom supplies an answer?

The House will not be surprised, I am sure, to learn from my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] that a high proportion of the millions of pamphlets and magazines being published under our information program, end up in waste baskets. For example, the gentleman from Nebraska has told us that thousands of copies of a magazine entitled "Eight Great Americans" are lying in embassy basements all over the world because the reading matter is not acceptable to local populations. I might add that these magazines cost 8 cents each to produce.

As for the news broadcasts of the Voice of America itself, the opinion is almost universal that there is entirely too much boasting about American living standards, American luxuries, and American big heartedness, and that when straight news reporting is attempted, it appears to be written for consumption by the American public and not the foreign audience for which it is intended.

In addition, the give-away complex which infects this administration is reflected in the Voice of America, which constantly tells foreign audiences about the wonderful things that we are doing for them in the way of loans and assistance programs, without explaining the terrific sacrifices required on the part of the American people.

It is little wonder that the average European thinks he is doing us a favor by accepting our unwanted agricultural surpluses. Why should not the average European be suspicious when this administration is constantly telling the American people we are growing richer day by day through giving away our substance and spending billions upon billions of borrowed dollars on questionable projects?

And why should not foreigners put their tongues in their cheeks when the Federal Government boasts that the American people have accumulated \$168,000,000,000 in savings in the 10-year period ending December 31, 1949, without telling them that during this same period the administration added \$218,000,000,000 to the Federal debt? No wonder the Communist propagandists quote these administration statistics on savings to prove Americans became rich from the war.



These gentlemen who meet in Washington's fog-filled drawing rooms might do better to consider the truthful propaganda line that Americans have shown themselves of capital needed for new factories, new homes, new highways, and new industrial equipment so that we could go steadily deeper into debt and export our goods abroad as gifts.

The administration insists its information and propaganda program is aimed at winning friends and influencing people. Mr. Barrett should learn what any press agent can tell you; you don't win friends by boasting how rich you are.

I am certain the House is well acquainted with the fact that despite some pretty fanciful figures from the State Department, the Voice has a very small listening audience throughout the world. The penetration in Russia is virtually nil, for, as one of my friends said recently, when the Voice of America comes on, you can hear the radio switches clicking off all over Europe.

We know the Russians are jamming the Voice and that very little of it is heard by the Russian people. The publication *Amerika*, which is supposed to be circulated in Russia, is still printed in large numbers despite the fact that only a fraction of the copies reach the Russian people and the rest are returned to us.

I want to quote to you from a dispatch to the New York Herald Tribune from London by that newspaper's correspondent there, Joseph Newman, a former Moscow correspondent:

Only a tiny fraction of Voice broadcasts get through to the Soviet Union, and there is no way of knowing how many persons receive that precious tiny fraction. From time to time the American authorities get word that someone in Moscow, Kiev, Irkutsk, or some other remote region of Russia has clearly heard a Voice broadcast. For lack of anything better, such scraps of information are used as the basis for optimistic claims which are probably intended to impress Congress at a time when additional financial support is necessary.

People overseas constantly claim that the Voice is beamed at them using announcers and narrators who do not speak the native tongue so as to be effectively and clearly understood. The complaint is frequent that the programs show no comprehension of local conditions and local problems and offer virtually no solution as to how America intends to meet the Communist menace.

In other words, it offers these people no hope.

Those of us who have taken the trouble to read the scripts used on the Voice of America find them almost uniformly impressed with the fact they are dull and uninteresting. They are just plain boring. They have no life, no sparkle, no imagination. A person would have to be desperate for entertainment to turn to such radio fare.

Perhaps it would be correct to attribute the failure of the Voice to too much Barrett, too much boredom, and too much baloney.

On the broader front of over-all policy, there can be no disputing the fact that the loss of American confidence in the

State Department exists the world over. There is little faith in a program such as the Voice of America when for the first 7 months of the Korean War, according to information reaching me, the role of Russia in that conflict was not mentioned a single time on the Voice. Nor can the peoples of the world, any more than the American people, understand how for five long years we could encourage the Communists in Asia while presumably discouraging them in Europe.

In short, few believe a program which is frankly the voice of Acheson can be the Voice of America. And who can blame them?

What should this House do about the pending appropriations?

The Voice, in its first year, received an appropriation of \$20,937,347.

In its second year the appropriation was \$31,100,000.

In its third year it was \$47,300,000.

In its fourth year it was \$70,500,000, with an additional \$50,000,000 for capital investment.

Now, as it starts its fifth year, we have an appropriations bill presented to the House giving the Voice program \$85,000,000, plus \$15,000,000 carry-over, on the capital investment program—\$100,000,000 in all to finance a conceded failure.

This is a temptation to say we should abolish the program.

I feel that would be a mistake. I am convinced most of my colleagues feel the same way. But we certainly do need to improve the product.

Unfortunately, I can see no way to improve the product so long as it remains in the hands of the present administration. The most we can hope to do is keep the framework of the Voice of America, and to pray we may soon evolve a firm foreign policy and a resolute program, administered by experts who have definite objectives and sound methods for achieving them.

But I can see no justification for maintaining any more than the framework until such a fortunate day is reached. We should keep the Voice on the air, but I am convinced the organization should be completely shaken up, the fat fried out of it, and the bureaucratic blunderings eliminated.

I wish to commend to this House the idea that it would be a decided waste of money to shut the Voice down completely, but it would be an equal waste of money to give the Voice \$100,000,000 this year. Therefore, I am prepared, and I think my colleagues feel the same as I do, to vote to reduce this appropriation to a figure more commensurate with the meager results we are now obtaining from the Voice.

I would also like to recall that in the Eightieth Congress the House set up an Air Policy Board which made a study of requirements for a balanced program of air power. Time has proven the recommendations of that Board sound and far ahead of the thinking of the administration in power. So I urge the House to consider the possibility of setting up a similar committee on the subject of psychological warfare and effective propaganda abroad. If the administration

will not move, then it is up to the Congress to act.

There is no need of endlessly sending good money after bad. We should cut this appropriation to a far more reasonable figure than has been reported by the Appropriations Committee, and, if the administration fails to improve the Voice of America, then the Congress should proceed immediately on a study of policy and program.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. The gentleman during the Eightieth Congress was a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and doubtless recalls that at that time our committee made a rather exhaustive investigation of the activities of the Voice of America with particular regard to their scripts. I wonder if the gentleman could inform me whether there has been any improvement of the scripts from those that were being used in 1948 and 1949?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I desire to be absolutely fair about it. If I remember correctly, although I am not sure of the exact time, we did exhibit here on the floor some of the scripts, copies of some of the things which were said, as well as some of the other propaganda that had been put out. As a result there was some stoppage, or some correction, of some of the more evident slanted propaganda in favor of one political party or some group of political candidates.

But as an over-all venture or activity certainly the Voice of America programs as of today are still very ineffective. They are still not meeting the requirements of this Nation, and are not doing the job that we want it to do abroad, and for that reason I have suggested that we must take steps to correct the present situation.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I just want to make this observation: That it was my experience during a trip with a select committee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in 1949 to be behind the iron curtain and talk with the citizens of two of those countries, Poland and Czechoslovakia. Their general reaction to the Voice of America was certainly that at best it was not contributing any constructive good so far as we were concerned; and in the main they felt that we were just failing to reach our objective and that most of our effort was wasted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is still happening throughout the world. In recent years it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of any straight-thinking American that the Voice has not given to the world the true American picture as to our position in world affairs, nor has it accomplished much toward getting world peace for which we had hoped and prayed it would.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, as a consistent but constructive critic for



some time past of the operations of the so-called Voice of America program I want to say that I have listened carefully to the very carefully prepared and mimeographed political speech of the gentleman from Ohio, and I find that he is as expertly misinformed as usual.

Mr. Speaker, in fairness to Assistant Secretary Barrett I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at this point the full Pathfinder news magazine article referred to by the gentleman from Ohio in his remarks just made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

EDWARD W. BARRETT CARRIES AMERICA'S CASE TO BOTH SIDES OF THE IRON CURTAIN

(This country has two principal voices—the Voice of America radio and the less-tangible voice of a free country, raised against the clamor of Red propaganda. Associate Editor Beverley M. Bowie reports on the man whose job is to talk to the world.)

JUNE 25, 1950

In the passageway outside the Assistant Secretary's office the news ticker reels out an endless ribbon of bad news: North Korean tanks, backed by infantry, have crossed the thirty-eighth parallel and are smashing southward toward Seoul. The names of lost towns curl upon the floor, unread and unremarked. For within the conference room have gathered the men who must counter the impact of such bulletins upon Asia and the West: the directors of the State Department's global network of information.

Tense, a bit disheveled (the news has tumbled them from Sunday morning snoozes), they hammer out the main line which all United States Government media, press, radio, and films, will take. No need to concoct anything fancy—the truth will carry a docksite wallop. It is the United Nations which has been attacked. It is the UN spearheaded by the United States, which defends the free world against aggression.

But speed is essential, for already the forewarned propaganda mills of Moscow are pouring out their topsy-turvy version of the Korean conflict. State's first move is to alert its Public Affairs staffmen in every country. Normally no bulletins go out on Sunday; today, by 3 p. m., full stories on the UN position are broadcast to each Far Eastern post and to major posts in the Near and Middle East, Europe, and Latin America.

Minutes after Truman announces the commitment of American planes, the Voice of America begins to beam 6 hours of steady programming in Korean, Mandarin, Cantonese, and slow English, blanketing the peninsula. Despite jamming by the Soviets, the text of the President's message is rocketed through the iron curtain in round-the-clock broadcasts, the negotiations are begun with France, Italy, England, Turkey, and Greece to step up the pressure-by-air on the U. S. S. R.

#### VOICE IN THE FIELD

Out in the field, United States information officers, running the gantlet from Seoul to Taejon, set up an impromptu news center. Daily bulletins posted on its walls are scanned eagerly by tens of thousands of Koreans. From its roof a loudspeaker brays four newscasts a day to soldiers, refugees, citizens. Three mobile units jounce over the country roads, distributing leaflets and telling the UN's story over public-address systems. State experts assigned to MacArthur's psychological warfare unit help Army coworkers prepare leaflets aimed at five groups: ROK troops, South Korean civilians, enemy

troops, North Korean civilians, farmers in overrun areas. Bombers are assigned to drop them by the million.

Back in Washington, State's motion-picture division puts together two realistic documentaries on Korea, rushes 1,100 prints in 26 languages all over the world. To follow it up, the press division begins a cartoon book, the Korea Story, scheduling 450,000 copies in English, more in Burmese, Arabic, Persian.

For a week the broadcasters, scriptmen, pamphleteers, and film men stay on the job day and night. For another fortnight they are on call at any hour. Not until the informational machine settles down for the long haul do they slack off to a 12-hour day; a 6-day week.

#### TOP BRASS

Key commander in this vast and intricate operation—in itself only one skirmish in the current world-wide battle for men's minds—Edward Ware Barrett, the chunky, hard-driving, 40-year-old executive who is Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Last week Barrett summed up what his cohorts accomplished in those first, furious days: "The situation was this: South Koreans and Americans were being pushed right down the peninsula. The Cominform was spending millions to convince the world that we were aggressors. All over Asia and Europe our enemies were gloating, our friends were quaking. We had to do three things, quickly: Get the Commies tagged by world opinion as the aggressors they were; isolate them by driving it home that 53 nations were against them, and identify the UN cause with that of freemen everywhere. We—and our allies—did it. We had the facts to back us up. We could even use our near-disaster to advantage—to show we obviously couldn't have planned aggression. Propaganda-wise, it was a victory.

"Don't misunderstand me. Information didn't do it alone—by any means. If the UN hadn't acted quickly and boldly, and if MacArthur's forces hadn't recovered so magnificently, we would have got nowhere. But, on the other hand, if information hadn't rammed home the significance of our action to every last hut and hamlet, the Russians, with their barrage of defeatism and confusion, might have cracked the moral unity of the democratic world."

Barrett could be wrong. But he believes what he says. And he has, in his Office of International Information, a propaganda weapon more formidable than any the reluctant Republic has ever fashioned. It may not perform the miracles its creators fondly expect. But that it exists at all is a minor miracle.

Long after every European country had seen the need of an agency to divide its enemies and unite its friends, the United States, delicately pinching its nose at the vulgar aroma of propaganda, refused to set up an information service of its own.

In World War I, Woodrow Wilson permitted the establishment of George Creel's blundering Committee of Public Information. In World War II, Franklin Roosevelt created—and thereafter ignored—the Office of War Information. But after each fracas, the rush to demobilize swept such organizations into the scrap basket.

#### MAKESHIFT

Three years ago, picking up where OWI left off, State patched together a rickety outfit designed to do much the same job. Run on a shoestring budget and headed by one-time advertising ace BILL BENTON (now Senator from Connecticut), the Office of Information had to content itself with putting across a full and fair picture of America for foreign consumption. "It was what the trade calls institutional advertising," says Barrett. Nice and necessary, but hardly enough for times like these.

Under its next director—career diplomat George V. Allen—the Office of Information fared no better. The most that Congress would vote its overworked, fanatically devoted little staff was \$47,300,000—far less than OWI's wartime budget.

Barrett, taking office last February, brought new hope to the agency—and got it more money. Roused at last by the propagandistic fury of Russia's "peace offensive," Congress tardily decided to ante up: The Joint Office of International Information and Educational Exchange got \$32,700,000 in September, \$79,000,000 more 3 weeks later.

#### FEEDING THE STEPCHILD

That still added up to less than the U. S. S. R. spends on information, less than the Navy would pay for one supercarrier, and only about what the United States tobacco industry allots for promotion and advertising. But at least we were raising the status of United States information from emaciated stepchild to participant in the council's of Government.

To State's psychological warriors the additional money looked good. Barrett looked even better. Benton, they reasoned, had known all about public relations, not much about Government. Allen had known all about bureaucracy, not much about the media of promotion. Barrett—a veteran of OWI and editorial director of a news magazine—would combine in one person the skills of both worlds.

By and large, Barrett appears to have lived up to expectations. Says one staff member: "Only man we've ever had around here who can keep an eye on all the jumping beans in this fantastic operation." Says another: "Wonderful to work for a man who can do any job in the shop as well—or better—than the guy who's sitting there." The theme song of Barrett's staff seems to be: Anything we can do, he can do better.

#### ON THE DOUBLE

Barrett, in brief, is primarily an operator. Such thinking as he expends on the philosophy of the program he does on the run or at long evening and Saturday planning sessions. Months ago he made up his mind what kind of an information job he wanted State to do; now he hustles up and down the corridors seeing that the job gets done. It's a rare employee who doesn't look up once in a while to find Barrett peering intently over his shoulder.

It may be that Barrett comes naturally by his capacity to carry off difficult situations. His father, editor of Alabama's Birmingham Age-Herald, once played dominoes all evening with circus owner John Ringling, ended by betting him the family car against an elephant.

"At 5:30 a. m.," recalls Barrett, "the editor of the Age-Herald arrived home complete with elephant and mahout. Somehow or other, my mother wasn't very keen about asking them in. So father stored the elephant in the family garage and went to bed. Next morning the elephant was still there—but not the front doors or the rear end of the garage.

"Boy. We kids had a time that day. We gave rides to half the neighborhood. But my father finally had to face the question: What was he going to do with the beast? The circus had moved in. And the Birmingham market for full-grown elephants was far from brisk.

"Well, he went down to the office and meditated. Next morning the Age-Herald began a new editorial campaign. Its theme: 'Birmingham Needs a Zoo.'"

#### TIGER FROM B'HAM

Pulling up stakes at the age of 15, young Barrett went north to prep school, entered Princeton in 1928. There he cashed in on two qualities that were to stand him in good stead: An ability to run and to write.



His first year, he made both the freshman track team and the Daily Princetonian, which he later edited.

Plunging into the newspaper field during its leanest years, Barrett continued to chalk up mileage as a reporter for the Birmingham News, as Washington correspondent for Newsweek, as staffman for Today, and back to Newsweek as associate editor. By 1939 he had acquired a wife (Mason Daniel, of Jacksonville, Fla.) and a mild reputation as one of the Nation's most strenuous journalists.

Had he joined the Armed Forces, it is quite possible he would have legged it into Paris ahead of even Ernest Hemingway. As it was, he trotted down to Washington to help start the Office of the Coordinator of Information, shifted to OWI's Cable-Wireless Division, became chief of its Overseas News and Features Bureau, went over to the Mediterranean to serve 6 months with Allies' Psychological Warfare Branch, then returned to take over direction of OWI's Overseas Branch from playwright Robert E. Sherwood.

After the war Barrett withdrew to New York to become Newsweek's editorial director. But, through his membership in the Council on Foreign Relations and his trusteeship in the Institute of International Education, he kept one eye cocked on information activities in the Capital. When the bid finally came from Truman, Barrett was not too surprised.

#### HARASSED CHAUFFEUR

Settling into his job, Barrett discovered its chief occupational affliction: he had become the chauffeur of a bus with a Nation-load of back-seat drivers. "There isn't a man on the streets of Washington," he mutters, "who doesn't know how to run the information program better than I do. And every other man eventually tells me so. Now and then we get a good idea this way. But they catch me at the office; they catch me at home. At a party, I can hardly take two steps toward a cocktail without being but-tonholed by somebody with a brand-new gimmick to outwit and befuddle the enemy. It's fine, you know, all this interest. Very healthy, and all that. But sometimes—"

To sandwich a little work in between these bouts of advice, Barrett gets to the office at 8:30, doesn't quit until at least 7, works all day Saturday. Deprived of his golf and swimming, he finds even his mile-a-day jaunts down State's halls insufficient. Wryly he admits: "I do setting-up exercises in the bathroom now, for Pete's sake."

Sundays, Barrett tries to catch up on his sleep. He has brought no elephants home to his two young daughters; but he hammers away with them at a sort of pygmy elephant hut in the back yard, in which the family's new black-and-white cocker spaniel will reside.

#### MOVE ON, PLEASE

Assistant Secretaries of State don't rate being driven to work in an official car. Barrett, though he recently acquired a 1950 Buick, usually careens down to Foggy Bottom in a beat-up 11-year-old Chevrolet which, he says, "has the general contours of a phone booth." The first time he tried to park it in the space reserved for top officials, the guard thought he was an impostor.

Feet on his vast mahogany desk, the Assistant Secretary talked readily enough last week about his post and its problems, with only an occasional nervous squint at the clock. "Listen," he drawled, "before I ever came down here the powers-that-be readily agreed to one thing; that I wasn't going to run any mimeograph mill just cranking out stories to justify decisions already reached. I feel any declaration of foreign policy, any step we take abroad, is going to affect the attitudes of other nations toward America.

Which is Information's province. So Information should be able to chip in its 2 cents before those moves are made."

Taking off his spectacles, Barrett grinned looking more than ever like a cautiously elated boy elected mayor-for-a-day. I must say we've got swell cooperation, all up and down the line. One Information man sits in on the key meetings, beginning with Secretary Acheson's at 9:30 every morning. The top command and the regional assistant secretaries now work with us in a grand way. What's more important, maybe, we have Public Affairs officers and staffs assigned to each of State's geographical divisions. They work right along with the political desks, keep us in touch with their day-to-day decisions, and keep them in touch with ours.

"Frankly, we have a fine team. My deputy, Howland Sergeant, was a top-flight wartime administrator with good international experience. Charles Hulten, our general manager, is a former newspaperman with a stand-out reputation in Government. Joe Phillips, our planning coordinator, was a distinguished foreign correspondent and editor. Foy Kohler, chief of the Voice, is a top-rank Russian expert and a good manager. And we have dozens of crack newsmen, radiomen, and education experts."

Barrett strode thoughtfully across the room to another chair, flopped in it. "The guts of the matter is this," he stated. "No information program is worth any more than the foreign policy it is based on. Look at the Commies. They set up this big peace offensive. They collect millions of signatures all over the world. They yell about the wicked, war-loving Americans and their nasty atom bomb. And it works, after a fashion. Then what do the Commies do? Pull the plug on the whole program by pushing the North Koreans into clear-cut aggressions."

#### EXPERT ADVICE

The telephone on Barrett's desk buzzed. He glared at it, ignored it. "It is as true of nations as of human beings: We are judged more by what we do than by what we say. People seem to think psychological warfare is just talking at people, or showing them pictures. It is not. An old expert once said: 'Good public relations is just acting right and letting people know about it.' For a long time we acted pretty well but did not bother to make our actions and our motives known. Today we are building the machinery for keeping the world informed, but the basis of that information must still be acting right. If we can engineer some land reforms in southeast Asia and help promote real economic improvement, it will be worth 20 divisions to us, or maybe 20 radio stations—though we will need a few to keep our actions from being misinterpreted.

"That's why I'm pretty happy about this Psychological Strategy Board. It's composed of the top men from the Joint Chiefs, Defense, ECA, Central Intelligence, National Security Resources Board, and State, with me as Chairman. Meets once a week, usually. The next one will be over at my house, where we can take off our coats and tackle the real problems of planning coordinated programs overseas so we get the maximum impact on the most people."

Barrett cupped his chin in his hands, glanced out the window at an industrious pigeon on the sill. "That's at the top echelon, of course. Below it the Board has a permanent staff drawing up long-term plans for the kind of psychological warfare America must wage if and when the shooting begins. Can't say much about that, of course." Asked to appraise the success of the information program so far, Barrett scratched his chin judiciously. "You might describe what we've done to date as a hold-

ing action. And we haven't always had enough ammunition, or even the right kind. We've sent mobile film units up into the hills of India—showing what? Sometimes a film made for Europe—and not too useful for Indians."

The Barrett fist thudded into the Barrett palm. "That's past history. Now we've got the funds, we're designing every program to hit a specific target group. We're outfitting ourselves with rifles, not shotguns. And we're going to take a lot of the master-minding and the sharpshooting out of Washington and put it where it belongs—in the missions overseas. They're in a much better position than we to decide exactly what works best with the local audience.

"But you've got to realize what we're up against. Take the people in the satellite nations and in the U. S. S. R. There's no point in telling them what scoundrels the Commies are; they know it at first-hand. Not much point, either, in telling them what angels we are; anybody would look better to them than their present masters. And there's even less point in urging them to rise and man the barricades; they'd just get one-way tickets to the concentration camp. It's better to feed them a steady, sustaining diet of the truth, convince them that time fights on the side of freedom—in short, strengthen their will to hang on and, perhaps, to drag their feet."

#### VOICE OF GERMANY

Grabbing a sheaf of papers from his desk, Barrett thumbed through them, "Listen to this," he said happily. "This is the kind of thing I mean. Here's a German who wrote us after he'd returned from 4 years as a prisoner of war in Russia. He was a radio man—built a public-address system for the camp. He says: 'Your direct-beaming Station Munich is received in the U. S. S. R. with excellent quality, stability and security, at all times of the day or year. Jamming from the Russians is at least 50 percent unsuccessful.' \* \* \* There is no one who owns a radio (rather many people now) who does not know and listen to your transmissions. Even the highest chiefs of police don't mind saying how happy they are to listen again to London or America. I was often called out of bed at night in order to tune in the western stations for the officers."

"Here's another one. A fellow writes us about the punishments the Russians inflict on anybody in Siberia tuning in the Voice of America. 'But everybody listens,' he says. 'The commander of a concentration camp listens, the director of a plant listens, the chairman of a collective farm listens. And if they listen, other people do the same or learn the news from them. People young and old listen. They meet in groups, post guards, and later spread the news everywhere.'

"Letters like that keep flooding in to our program evaluation branch—30,000 a month—from all parts of the globe. You never realize what a precious commodity truth is until you hear half the world crying out for it."

#### CRITICS

The phone rang insistently, stopped. Barrett went on: "I've got 42 voices, you might say—that's the number of languages we use in getting our program across to the world. But if I had 84, I couldn't guarantee we'd make everybody love us Americans.

"It's a funny thing about our critics, though. They tend to contradict each other. One bunch beats us over the head because the Voice is 'too pussyfooting,' or 'too pedantic,' or 'too dependent on the news.' The other gang jumps us for getting too propagandistic and nonobjective. Well, they're both right—to this extent: We're trying now,



to mix up our programs—half firm, honest news and half hard-hitting messages, clearly labeled as such."

This time, the phone would not be denied. Barrett picked it up, said "Yes" politely three times. "No," once, and put it down. "Mind you," he said, "the people on the Hill have been swell, most of them. The one fellow we've had real trouble with is a distinguished gentleman who keeps telling his fellow politicians that, after a profound study of the Voice of America, he's concluded it's no good."

"I went up there to chat with him. He admitted to me that, though he'd looked through some of our scripts, he hadn't heard a Voice broadcast in 4 years. I invited him to drop by the studios and attend some shows. He thanked me—and never came. But he goes right on yelling about the rotten job we're doing."

#### CALCULATED RISK

Grinning ruefully, Barrett rose. "We can take it," he said. "And we'll have to get used to taking it a lot more. Because we're not going to play supersafe and cautious. We're going to stick our necks out, and we're bound to make a few mistakes. We may get our heads bashed in now and then but \* \* \*

He held open the door. Glancing at the crowded antechamber, he winced, half-closed the door again. "I'll tell you: when I first brought my family down here, I beefed to a colleague because we'd found a house but couldn't get into it for three more months. He stared at me and said: 'What makes you think you'll still be here in 3 months?'"

"Well, that was 10 months ago, and I'm still here. So far, I guess, so good."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is very easy to take the well of this House and make general statements that are not supported by the facts. When anyone makes the statement that the Voice of America had not accomplished any good, that statement is inconsistent with the facts, as has been proven by the effort behind the iron curtain to see that the Voice of America is not heard. None of us are perfect.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not believe the gentleman from Massachusetts has correctly interpreted the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown]. I think the gentleman said they had not accomplished much good.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman, who was on the Expenditures Committee with me, did make that statement. My reference was not to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. It would seem rather queer if the Voice has been a complete failure behind the iron curtain that Russia would be spending millions, as much or even more than we are spending for the Voice, to jam it. If it is not reaching anybody why would they go

to all that trouble to jam the Voice of America?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall make some remarks while this bill is under consideration presenting evidence in support of what I now say. The Soviet Union is spending at least \$1,000,000,000 a year for propaganda purposes aimed at the free countries of the world and directly and ultimately at the United States of America. I think that statement answers the observation and inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Hays].

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] picked out a magazine article about Assistant Secretary Barrett and referred to one sentence in which there was something said or purported to have been said by Assistant Secretary Barrett in reference to land reform in other parts of the world. When the gentleman from Ohio was elaborating in his prepared statement, which is very unusual for him as he is one of the best extemporaneous speakers I have ever heard, my thoughts and my mind went back to the day that General MacArthur addressed this body.

I remember that on that occasion General MacArthur devoted a considerable part of his speech to land reform, to social justice, and to the problems of meeting human suffering and distress in other countries of the world, particularly in the Near East, in the Middle East, and the Far East.

I obtained a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day to be sure that my recollection was correct. I remember as I sat on the floor of the House listening to General MacArthur—and I was one of those who agreed with his views and the intent that he had in mind from the humanitarian angle—I thought that if those words came from the lips of a Democrat instead of from the lips of General MacArthur, a great military leader who has made mistakes like all of us have made, some serious but who is a Republican in politics, we would be accused of world socialism or global WPA.

Now, let me refresh your memory as to some of the statements that General MacArthur made not so long ago, and as I read these statements the brief observation made by Assistant Secretary Barrett becomes minor in comparison with the views of General MacArthur.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to thank the gentleman and to congratulate him on referring to General MacArthur, especially in view of the fact that the Voice of America, on a number of its programs, has attempted to deprecate that which General MacArthur stated.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no knowledge of that and I would not approve of it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman would not.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no knowledge of it. I like to see the evidence and the proof, but, if that is so, I would agree with the gentleman in that re-

spect. You gentlemen may offer the proof. I say if it is there I would agree with the gentleman in that respect.

Coming back to April 19, when General MacArthur was addressing a joint session in this Chamber, what were some of the things he said on that occasion?

The Communist threat is a global one. Its successful advance in one sector threatens the destruction of every other sector.

Most of my Republican friends, by their votes, do not agree with that. He further said:

Beyond pointing out these general truisms, I shall confine my discussion to the general areas of Asia. Before one may objectively assess the situation now existing there, he must comprehend something of Asia's past and the revolutionary changes which have marked her course up to the present. Long exploited by the so-called colonial powers, with little opportunity to achieve any degree of social justice—

How strange those words must sound to my friend from Ohio, and if Assistant Secretary Barrett had used these words, my friend, in his prepared remarks, would have been much more severe than he was by making slight reference to land reforms—

with little opportunity to achieve any degree of social justice, individual dignity, or a higher standard of life—

Coming from General MacArthur, and I agree with that, that is perfect in the minds of most of my friends on the Republican side, but coming from a Democrat, why that would be subject to the most severe, discolored interpretation and criticism possible.

Then he further said:

Mustering half of the earth's population and 60 percent of its natural resources, these peoples are rapidly consolidating a new force, both moral and material, with which to raise the living standard and erect adaptations of the design of modern progress to their own distinct cultural environments.

Let me go a little further and refresh your memory as to what General MacArthur said on that occasion:

Their prewar standard of life, pitifully low, is infinitely lower now in the devastation left in war's wake. World ideologies play little part in Asian thinking and are little understood.

Let me call this to your attention:

What the people strive for—

And he is referring to the people of Asia—

What the people strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs—

Today, if that came from a Democrat, that would be misinterpreted and discolored: World socialism, global WPA, destroying the financial strength of our country. Oh, would not this Chamber be ringing with the speeches that would be prepared by the Republican National Committee or others condemning any Democrat or any official connected with the present administration who would dare use that language and express such thoughts?

What the peoples strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs—



What did he further say?—

a little better clothing on their backs, a little firmer roof over their heads, and the realization of a normal nationalist urge for political freedom. These political-social conditions have but an indirect bearing upon our own national security, but do form a backdrop to contemporary planning which must be thoughtfully considered if we are to avoid the pitfalls of unrealism.

It is all right for General MacArthur to call it "contemporary planning which must be thoughtfully considered if we are to avoid the pitfalls of unrealism" in connection with the people of Asiatic countries, but severe condemnation and criticism would be showered upon any Democrat who would dare use that kind of language or anything like it.

General MacArthur realizes that a powerful military is not the sole answer to the challenge of Asia. General MacArthur realizes that a powerful military is necessary, that it is necessary for the purpose of preserving our country in case of attack, in case of another global war. It is necessary as a possible deterrent to such an attack.

One thing General MacArthur impressed on my mind indelibly as a result of his address here on April 19 is that he recognizes that the only thing, as I have said repeatedly in this Chamber and outside this Chamber, that the Communists respect is what they fear, and the only thing they fear is power, material power greater than they possess themselves. But ours is not alone a material civilization, ours is a spiritual civilization. General MacArthur recognizes the power and the force of the moral influences upon men and women who believe as you and I do.

There are hundreds of millions of men and women throughout the world who believe as we do, not only outside the iron curtain but behind the iron curtain. There are countless millions of persons behind the iron curtain believing as we do who are looking for the day of deliverance, and they constitute in the day of crisis, if it comes, a real menace and a real weakness to the Communist dictators.

General MacArthur realizes that while we must be powerful from a military angle, and I agree with him, we believe in the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God, and what we believe in is an affirmative way of life, not a negative or destructive way of life.

General MacArthur recognizes that the moral truth we believe in, the spiritual truths that are ours, whether we are Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, and we all believe in God, direct us to be affirmative, direct us not to be negative, direct us to try to accomplish within our means those things that constitute the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

When Mr. Barrett was talking about land reform he had that in mind. When General MacArthur referred to the people of Asia and the necessity for our doing something, some realistic contemporary planning that would help meet their economic problems within our limits and our powers, he recognized that that was carrying out a spiritual mission and performing a spiritual duty.

I think that Assistant Secretary Barrett, instead of being criticized for what he said, should be highly complimented. What he said was minor in comparison to what General MacArthur said in this very Chamber, and which we all applauded, his address to this joint session in this Chamber on April 19. I congratulate General MacArthur for what he said in connection with this, the forward-looking affirmative duty and responsibility that is ours. I compliment him. My friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] would not dare condemn or criticize General MacArthur for what he said, yet General MacArthur's statements were at least a thousand times broader than the limited observation made by Assistant Secretary Barrett in the article that appeared in the magazine that has been referred to.

I congratulate General MacArthur for what he said on this occasion on April 19. I also congratulate Assistant Secretary Barrett for what he said.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to disagree with my good friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], but on this fundamental issue I do not believe you can cure the ills of the Voice of America, and it probably has some, by cutting off that Voice. It is fundamental that the right way to cure a headache is not to cut off the head. I was interested in what the majority leader said and in what he read from the speech of General MacArthur, because it makes me think of one of the lessons I learned in grammar school, where they taught us that the three principal things that man must have to survive are food, clothing, and shelter.

To that I would like to add a fourth, and that is a freedom of spiritual being and the right to worship God as he pleases.

Mr. Speaker, I was behind the iron curtain with this select committee, with the gentleman from Indiana. I think he will agree that wherever we went there, and wherever we talked to the ordinary common people of those countries, and they found out we were Americans, we were welcome. They liked us. They liked us not as individuals, because they did not know us, but they liked us as Americans. They must have known something about America and Americans. I do not say they found it all out from the Voice of America. I think one of the potent sources of information to those people are from their friends and relatives who may have emigrated to this country and who are now in the second, third, and fourth generation. However, if the Voice of America helps even a little in keeping this friendship alive, it is worth while.

I pleaded when I made speeches back in Ohio for those people to keep in touch with their friends and relatives in Europe and to tell them about the conditions here and about what can happen to the basic needs of mankind in a democracy such as this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman stated that he disagrees with what I have said. I am sure he is sincere in expressing that disagreement. I wonder just what it is the gentleman disagrees with? Does he disagree with the statement I made that we should continue the Voice of America program? Does he think we should abandon it entirely?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. No; I think the gentleman knows wherein he and I disagree.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman agree with that statement which I made?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I will tell you exactly where you and I disagree.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman disagree with that statement? I would like to know whether the gentleman disagrees with that statement or not?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further.

I disagree that we should cut off or trim down the funds of the Voice of America, because in my opinion there is a great job to be done. If what the gentleman says is true, and he has picked out a few isolated instances, and I say that the Voice is probably not perfect, the thing to do is to perfect it. We have the power and the authority here in Congress to do it and to make it possible for the Voice of America to do the job it should do.

But we cannot do that job by cutting off the Voice of America.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then the gentleman does agree with me that we should attempt to make it better?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Just how would you make it better, will you explain that to the House? Just what do you think we should do?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I will answer that.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I gave some ideas on that subject.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman did not give any concrete ideas. His speech was mostly criticism. Now I know my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] well enough to know that he is sincere and that he wants to improve the Voice of America. That can best be done by constructive criticism.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I commend the gentleman and agree with him wholeheartedly in the statement that he has made as to our mutual experience. What he has said is entirely true. The friends we have behind the iron curtain are those who may have relatives here and, I might add, very thoughtful relatives here who have by their letters and by their gift packages and in many other ways manifested their affection for their homeland, and have built up for us friendships that are far greater than any that might be built in any other way to contribute to them.

In response to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I want to say it was not my intention to say that we should discontinue the Voice of America. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr.



McCORMACK] misinterpreted me in saying that nothing could have come from the Voice of America. I did not intend to leave that impression, if I did.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I commend the gentleman and hope that there can be a meeting of minds on a constructive plane as to how we can best improve and make more effective our means of conveying to the world why and how democracy works in America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in a speech which I have made, several speeches of the Voice of America in the Bohemian language.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, are these the gentleman's own speeches?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the request to print them in the Bohemian language in the RECORD?

Mr. SABATH. I want the translated speech that I made to the Czechoslovakians printed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You are going to print them in English?

Mr. SABATH. Why, of course.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is only because of the attack of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], an eminent newspaper writer, editor, and publisher, against the Voice of America program, that I rise to state that I concede its work is not perfect, but we all know that there is nothing perfect under the sun. However, I am acquainted with some of the work of that organization as evidenced by the radio broadcasts made by several Members of the House to countries behind the iron curtain. I, myself, have made four such broadcasts to Czechoslovakia in my native language. I made the last broadcast only a few weeks ago and I feel it has done some good. It was beamed from an overseas station to Czechoslovakia where I am well known, having cooperated with the late President Thomas Masaryk in the early days of that country's independence and later with former President Eduard Benes who went into exile when the Communists took over the rule of that freedom-loving country.

I have frequently taken the floor to prevail upon the membership that our country should demonstrate to these people that a democratic form of government that gives freedom and opportunity to all, such as ours, is the best form of government that has ever been devised. In my broadcasts I have pleaded and urged these people to stand fast and to continue to fight in the hope that communistic control will be weakened and that it is but temporary, and not to surrender to communistic oppression.

Mr. Speaker, the Voice of America is rendering a real service with telling effect upon the countries behind the iron curtain, lending encouragement to those

freedom-loving peoples in whose hearts the beacon light of liberty still fearlessly burns. Their only source of news of the outside world is through the medium of these broadcasts and they want to know the truth about the democracies' fight against the Communist threat to the nations of the free world.

I do not wish to repeat the words of General MacArthur with respect to the subjugated peoples of the world, including those under the heel of communism, except to say that "a little more food in their stomachs, a little more clothing on their backs, a little more firmer roof over their heads" will serve to eliminate communism more than military might. To those countries under the domination of Russian oppression, we can only give words of hope and comfort and the Voice of America is doing that job with stronger force every day. Shall we throttle or curtail the activities of such an agency whose effective work is becoming plainer and more evident every day, judging from the reports that are finding their way out from behind the iron curtain? I say "No," and I hope a majority of the membership will join me in keeping the appropriation intact, yes, that they will support an amendment to increase it.

Mr. Speaker, without taking up the further time of the House, I shall insert a translation in English of the broadcast which I made over radio station Munich on June 9, 1951. It is as follows:

ANNOUNCER. Representative SABATH, your name is widely known in Czechoslovakia since the first world war. During that war the Czech press wrote a great deal about the effective help you gave President Masaryk in his effort to free nationalities then under Hapsburg oppression. Could you give us a brief outline of your activity?

Mr. SABATH. Gladly. Soon after the outbreak of that war and as soon as Masaryk became recognized as the leader of the liberating movement, I began working among my colleagues in the Congress, through the American press, as well as through my contacts with President Wilson. I tried to bring about a better understanding of the worthiness of the Czechs for political freedom. At that time many nationalistic minorities sought American sympathy. So that Czech aims would receive full comprehension by the Congress and President Wilson, required endless effort on my part.

The end of the struggle daily became more apparent. The Germans were at a standstill on the French front. Austria-Hungary was beaten in Italy and Serbia. The Hapsburgs saw their finish and tried for a separate peace. President Wilson and the American public were absorbing their propaganda.

The opinion was that allied troops, freed of the Austrian front, would strengthen our armies in France. That way the end of German resistance would be hastened. I, however, feared that a precipitate peace with the Hapsburgs would create much harm and continue the subjection of the Czechs and the Slovaks.

When I stated this publicly I won very few supporters. Therefore I turned straight to President Wilson. At first he differed with me and expressed opposition. However, he did not disapprove entirely. After a second conference he promised that the question of peace with Austria-Hungary and independence for Czechoslovakia would not be decided by him prior to his further consideration of them with me. Soon afterward I was at the White House on other business. I was waiting to see the Presi-

dent in the reception room. His secretary, Mr. Tumulty, privately questioned me as to whether I came to talk about Czechoslovakia. I replied, "No"; that the subject of my visit was altogether different. Tumulty emphasized that since my previous visits President Wilson had been studying my point of view and that daily he was becoming more convinced that my position was right.

I welcomed that information and brought up the subject with the President once more. Mr. Wilson told me that he arrived at my opinion; that he had convinced himself that independence of Czechoslovakia and other subject nationalities must, in essence, become a part of the Allied peace terms. From that time on Mr. Wilson was very friendly toward the Czechoslovaks. Soon thereafter he proclaimed that condition to the world. Nevertheless, Austria-Hungary surrendered and the Czechoslovak Republic was recognized by the United States.

When Masaryk was returning from Vladivostok, across America to Czechoslovakia, some of his admirers tried to obtain an audience for him with President Wilson. Those efforts failed. As soon as I heard of it I intervened in Masaryk's behalf. I was convinced that a meeting between Masaryk and Wilson would result in greement of two great minds. Although Wilson was burdened by momentous problems he listened to my account of Masaryk's understanding of European history and its political goals; that Masaryk was thoroughly versed in Slav and German aspirations; and that because he was a professor of philosophy he was especially talented in clear and convincing presentation of those subjects to the public; and that a welcome accorded Masaryk would inspire all the Slav people and especially the Slav volunteers and deserters who were joining allied forces on all fronts. In consequence Wilson granted the audience. Masaryk was received wholeheartedly and the two presidents spent several hours in conference. From the meetings of these two historical giants developed great benefits for Czech and Slovak peoples.

ANNOUNCER. Congressman SABATH, you also helped President Benes during World War II?

Mr. SABATH. Yes. As a matter of fact help was extended to President Benes by the entire United States.

Between the first and second World Wars the good will of the American people for Czechoslovakia reached its peak.

When Chamberlain sold you out to Hitler we in America were very deeply concerned. We hoped that your brave soldiers and your modern armament would punish the fascists effectively. But history states that that did not eventuate.

When President Benes came to the United States in 1943 again I tried to be helpful. He had a meeting with President Roosevelt, with Secretary of State Hull, and with other personages in the American Government. All of America respected you for your perseverance in opposing German barbarity.

There is no time on this radio period for me to tell about all the effort expended by the American people in behalf of Czechoslovakia. Suffice it to say that during the entire Second World War we Americans worked persistently, just like you did, so that Czechoslovakia again would attain its liberty. And, everywhere possible we supported your underground workers and activities.

ANNOUNCER. Do you think, Mr. SABATH, that the present subjugation of Czechoslovakia by the oppression of communism will endure?

Mr. SABATH. Just the reverse. I am sure that communism in Czechoslovakia as well as in other exploited nations is but temporary. I am sure that a nation which gave the world such great liberty-loving men as Hus, Masaryk, Macha, and Bezruc, never will



surrender to oppression; and that it will destroy those who purloined power by intimidation and treachery. I am certain that no Czechoslovak will give up to a tyranny which denies him freedom of individual action and right to an independent existence. I am sure that the fantasy of absolute economic, political and social allkeness of all, preached by the inebriates of communism, is just as absurd to Czechoslovaks as it is to Americans.

Communism is not endowed with supernatural might entirely to remake a whole nation into an identic and fallacious pattern. Each human differs from every other human. Human individuality cannot be extirpated by communism and fraudulent promises. The personal ego is innate and threats, trickery, and violence cannot uproot it. Only a cringing serf or a cunning self-seeker will submit to an impracticable and mendacious communistic oligarchy. Had you wanted barbaric overlordship you should have retained the Hapsburgs.

We Americans are sure that you Czechoslovaks shall throw off the tyranny by which again you now are shackled. I am positive that you know the difference between the bastard democracy heralded by the Communists, in which you merely are exploited robots of terroristic overlords, and that democracy in which freedom of conscience, freedom of effort, freedom of earnings and self-government rule.

Soon will come the day when unabridged liberty again shall be yours. In your resistance I wish you boldness and steadfast perseverance. Strive as you strove during the years of the two world wars. The time of your resurgence is nearing.

Long live a free and honestly democratic Czechoslovak republic.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you Congressman SABATH. I am sure that your encouraging words will inspire the Czech and Slovak people to increased exertion for freedom from despotic communism.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I repeat that the Voice of America is rendering a real service in its broadcasts. We should continue its functions and even on a larger scale in our efforts for peace and the avoidance of a third world war.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the pending bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand the time is to be equally divided between the majority and the minority?

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the time is to be equally divided.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the con-

sideration of the bill H. R. 4740, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is entitled to recognition for 3 hours, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is entitled to recognition for 3 hours.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

#### KEEP POLITICS OUT OF FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] for pointing out the apparent schism among Republican leaders over the views of Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

In his violent criticism of Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, and as such director of Voice of America activities, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was actually, in effect, telling his side of the aisle that General MacArthur had fed Congress a lot of "baloney"—to use the gentleman's own phrase—when he appeared before the joint session on Thursday, April 19, 1951, and said this to our membership:

Before one may objectively assess the situation now existing there—

#### General areas of Asia—

he must comprehend something of Asia's past and the revolutionary changes which have marked her course up to the present. Long exploited by the so-called colonial powers, with little opportunity to achieve any degree of social justice, individual dignity, or a higher standard of life such as guided our own noble administration in the Philippines \* \* \* the peoples of Asia now see the dawn of new opportunity \* \* \*.

What the peoples strive for is the opportunity for a little more food in their stomachs, a little better clothing on their backs, a little firmer roof over their heads.

With these statements of General MacArthur I wholeheartedly agree, and I am amazed that our colleague from Ohio considers such factors so unimportant.

As I said I am pleased that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has reminded the gentleman from Ohio that the attack he directed against Mr. Barrett was nothing less than an attack on the philosophy of General MacArthur.

The gentleman from Ohio repeatedly made the statement that the Voice of America has been a conceded failure. I do not believe any fair-minded person will agree with him, nor will they agree with him that this Nation does not have a definite foreign policy. It not only has a definite foreign policy but it has a successful foreign policy which has resisted Communist aggression at every turn and has repeatedly stopped its advance. Witness the defeat of Communist aggression in Western Europe because of our strong policy as enunciated in the Truman doctrine. Will the gentleman

from Ohio say the Greek-Turkish aid program was a failure? Will he claim that the encouragement which our foreign policy has given to the nations of Western Europe has not thrown back the Communists in Italy, France, and all the other nations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Our strong foreign policy has definitely stopped the advance of the Communist aggressor in every part of the world and the gentleman from Ohio knows that. The thing for every Member of this House to do is to strive to keep our foreign policy out of politics and to work together in support of the President to throw a united opposition against aggressors who threaten the peace of the world. There are things more important than party politics.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, before taking up the items in this pending bill H. R. 4740 making appropriations for the fiscal year 1952 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and for the Federal judiciary, I wish to point out that your committee sat long and laboriously considering the details of the various items contained in this bill. I do not believe that a more harmonious subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations or a more harmonious committee of the House ever were grouped together to consider such important legislation and to do so in such a fair and courteous manner.

I wish to commend my fellow committee members: the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVELAND], for their kind assistance to and patience with me as chairman during the many, many days of hearings. I am deeply obligated to each and every one of them for their valuable assistance in ferreting out the details of the many items in this bill which have resulted in proper reductions by your subcommittee.

This is the sixth year in which I have served on this subcommittee with the distinguished and able gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. I admire, I adore the gentleman from Nebraska. It is always a pleasure to serve with him. I feel that I would be remiss in common courtesy if I did not call to the attention of the House the splendid cooperation he gave his fellow committee members and the courtesies we have always received from him. They were the same courtesies I received from him as a member of the same committee during the Eightieth Congress when he was the chairman.

I wish to thank the capable gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] who substituted for one of the minority Members for a number of days during the hearings as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] who sat in on the mark-up of the bill. I would be entirely remiss if I did not at this time express the thanks of the committee here on the floor of the House to the executive secretary of our committee,



Mr. Jay B. Howe, formerly with the FBI, who has worked long and arduously in helping us to get together this huge and interesting appropriation bill; and to thank his assistant, Mr. Bob Moyer, who assisted at all the daily hearings on the bill during the course of the early months of this year.

I think the committee has written a good bill; I am sure the committee cannot be successfully criticized for not having economized in connection with this appropriation request. Generally, no matter what a Subcommittee on Appropriations does, it is always subject to criticism. A department or agency of the Government may request the Bureau of the Budget for a certain sum of money, let us say a million dollars, and the Bureau of the Budget, without any rhyme or reason or explanation to anyone, can cut that request to the extent of \$500,000. When the Committee on Appropriations is asked for that \$500,000 it cannot make a further cut in that amount without being able to explain on this floor to anyone who asks the question why the cut was made and the reasons therefor.

This committee was asked to appropriate the sum of \$1,258,296,141 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Federal judiciary in fiscal year 1952. Your committee cut that requested amount to the extent of 16.4 percent, to \$1,051,715,115, a reduction of \$206,581,026. There are contained in the bill a great many items which are utterly necessary for national defense and which could not be cut in good judgment by your committee.

If you refer to the summary on page 2 of the committee report on this bill you will find that the bulk of the cuts are centered in the Departments of State and Commerce. Insofar as the Department of Justice is concerned, we were asked for the amount of \$184,356,000. Your committee saw fit to reduce that to \$181,667,000, a cut of \$2,689,000. It is impossible to sensibly cut the Department of Justice phase of this bill any further when you consider that included herein are such important Government agencies as the Attorney General's Office, including all of the divisions thereof—the Criminal Division, the Tax Division, the Customs Division, all admittedly hard-working offices—which are producing results with which everybody in the country is pretty well satisfied and which produce revenue for the Treasury. When you consider that included in the bill for the Department of Justice is the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Federal Prison System, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, fees and expenses of witnesses and salaries of United States attorneys and marshals, you find that these appropriation requests cannot be cut any further than your committee unanimously pared them.

With regard to the appropriations requests for the Federal judiciary, requests to the amount of \$26,489,740, your committee found unanimously that we could safely delete from the bill the amount of \$571,625, leaving an appropriation for the instant fiscal year of \$25,918,115 to operate our Federal courts.

With regard to the request for the Department of Commerce, where we were

asked to appropriate the amount of \$763,763,925, your committee saw fit to cut the sum of \$151,065,925, almost 20 percent, so that the net amount appropriated or carried in the bill for that Department is the sum of \$612,698,000.

It should be noted with regard to the total amount recommended in this bill for the fiscal year 1952, to wit, the sum of \$1,051,715,115; that this amount allowed by the committee is over 13 percent less than the amount \$1,212,412,637 appropriated in the last fiscal year for the same agencies.

Insofar as the Department of State is concerned, every single item for that Department has been reduced to some extent, with one exception. I refer to the Philippine rehabilitation program, wherein the committee was called upon to pay out in cash \$3,000,000 to liquidate prior contract authority—prior authority which caused a valid legal obligation on the part of the Government to pay for work done under contracts already entered into.

The provision exempting the Department of State from the law prescribing the use of vessels of United States registry by any officer or employee of the United States, has been deleted. Basic law requires that officers and employees of the United States use American ships. We have seen fit—and at the moment I am frank to say that I am not sure that we are absolutely right in doing this but we certainly think it is worthy of a trial in order to help the American merchant marine—to require that as many employees as possible in the Department use American ships. If as time goes on we find that this is going to result in a more costly operation insofar as the American taxpayer is concerned, we can revert to the present practice.

Now with regard to the item in the Department of State title of this bill for what is described as Department of State, salaries and expenses, I call your attention to the fact that this appropriation covers not only the salaries and expenses of the entire Department but of approximately 300 Foreign Service posts throughout the world. The amount recommended represents a reduction of \$1,900,000 in the budget estimate, and is \$2,992,000 below the amount of \$78,492,000 appropriated for this item for the fiscal year just ended. However, the fiscal year 1951 appropriation included certain nonrecurring items totaling \$3,823,133, the largest of which was \$3,615,000 for USIE, that is the Information and Education Service, the so-called Voice of America, for administrative support to be financed under that appropriation in 1952. The amount included allows for statutory promotions but provides for no staff increase and limits the expenditures for other purposes to that of fiscal year 1951.

The committee has included in the bill language providing that not less than \$10,000,000 of the amount allowed for the State Department shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States. So that we require the Department of State, insofar as total

appropriations allowed for salaries and expenses, Department of State, are concerned, to use at least \$10,000,000 of the \$75,500,000 appropriation in foreign credits and foreign currencies.

In regard to representation allowances, the committee was requested for the amount of \$1,000,000 and saw fit to reduce that amount by the sum of \$150,000. Later on in the debate my esteemed friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] will claim that this is the booze bill for the Department of State, and we will again debate the matter as we have now year after year. Let me point out at this time that representation allowances are to reimburse officers of the Foreign Service for expenses incurred by them at their posts of duty throughout the world for entertainment necessary in the conduct of their official duties and for purchases of flowers, wreaths, and similar tokens for presentation in accordance with local custom on appropriate occasions. This appropriation was intended to remove personal wealth as a prerequisite to appointment to high positions in the Foreign Service. If we are going to attack this appropriation, we are on our way back to the old system under which we will not have career diplomats in the important diplomatic posts throughout the world, under which we will have only those who are in the million-dollar class and who can afford to use their own funds for the purposes mentioned. This was a reform that took place a number of years ago, and was received with acclaim by the Congress and by the people of the United States.

In regard to the Foreign Service retirement and disability fund one might think at first glance that the cut made in this item is a very substantial and drastic one. The budget estimate of \$4,627,000 to be paid into the Foreign Service retirement and disability trust fund, established to provide annuities for Foreign Service officers, is presently disallowed for the reason that there was an existing balance as of June 30, 1950, of \$13,923,100, and the annual cost of the annuities is approximately only \$1,200,000. It is felt that under no circumstances will we be called upon during fiscal year 1952 to supply any further funds for this purpose.

The total amount recommended in the bill for the Department of Justice is an increase of \$23,445,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951. The major items of increase above the amount appropriated for 1951 are for the FBI, \$20,728,000; Immigration and Naturalization Service, \$2,160,000; and for general legal activities, \$1,127,000. The major part of these increases is necessary to annualize the salaries and expenses for additional personnel authorized on a part-year basis in supplemental appropriations for 1951 made for the purpose of enforcing the Internal Security Act and to assure adequate protection to this country from the threat of communistic and other subversive activities.

As I have already pointed out the budget estimates for the Department of Commerce, exclusive of maritime activ-



ities for which appropriations for fiscal year 1952 were contained in the Independent Offices appropriation bill, total \$763,763,925. The appropriations for fiscal year 1951, as reduced under section 1214 amounted to \$712,652,886 plus contract authority of \$40,865,000, for a total of \$753,517,886. The bill appropriates \$612,698,000, a reduction of \$151,065,925 below budget estimates and a decrease of \$140,819,886 below the amount of cash and contract authority granted for fiscal year 1951.

The total recommended by the committee for the Civil Aeronautics Administration is \$159,623,000. This is a reduction of \$40,060,000 from the amount of the budget estimates.

The committee reiterates once again that it is strongly of the opinion that the Government should be reimbursed by the commercial airlines for many of the services presently rendered without charge by this agency. The Federal Government cannot continue indefinitely building and operating more and more facilities for use by the commercial airlines without receiving any reimbursement therefor.

The sum of \$99,100,000, a reduction of \$3,700,000 in the amount of the budget estimate, is approved for salaries and expenses. The amount recommended is \$600,000 over the sum appropriated for fiscal year 1951. The committee recognizes the important role of this agency in national defense and in promoting and safeguarding safety in air travel. Were it not for these factors a greater reduction would have been recommended. The committee feels that the necessary programs of the administration can be carried on within the funds allowed without impairing in any way safety in aviation. No part of the reduction shall cause any relaxation in maximum safety standards.

Over 75 percent of this appropriation is required for the operation of Federal airways which include such facilities as airport traffic-control towers, aeronautical communication stations, air route traffic-control centers, radio ranges, instrument landing systems, airport surveillance radar, and precision approach and surveillance radar.

The committee was advised that economies as previously recommended by the committee had been effectuated. The amount allowed will require that a continuing evaluation be made of the various facilities operated in the Federal airway system and that those which are outmoded and least effective be eliminated.

The committee recommends \$3,550,000 for the Civil Aeronautics Board. This is a reduction of \$350,000 in the amount of the budget estimate. The increase of \$50,000 allowed over fiscal year 1951 is to provide for such mandatory items as within-grade salary advancements.

It will be recalled that a year ago this committee and the Congress saw fit to decrease the request of this Board from \$4,323,000 to \$3,500,000, a reduction in funds to the extent of \$823,000. At that time the committee and the Congress were severely criticized and were ac-

cused of ruining and gutting the CAB. However, on March 19 of this year, the then chairman of the CAB advised the committee as follows:

Mr. ROONEY. How is the Board functioning?

Mr. RENTZEL. That is a matter of opinion, I imagine, but I think it is running pretty good.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it functioning a bit more smoothly than it was?

Mr. RENTZEL. We think so. We have just completed our reorganization over there and the principal objectives, a month ago, to be exact, the principal objective was to streamline the organization of the Board and give it some central direction to establish some policies and to eliminate the duplication, and we are hopeful that we have met the criticisms that have been aimed at the Board by this committee and others and we feel that we are getting a job done. We are getting rid of some of the backlog.

Mr. ROONEY. How is that alleged imposing backlog coming along?

Mr. RENTZEL. We admit some of it was paper backlog. We are trying to get rid of those. A lot of those cases are cases which were filed for defensive reasons.

Mr. ROONEY. You are not trying to flatter the committee, are you, Mr. Rentzel, by pointing out that a lot of the backlog was paper backing? We were the first to suspect that.

Mr. RENTZEL. I am aware of your criticisms and I might say that we took the committee report last year and attempted to meet each one of them that we could.

It is recommended that legislation be enacted to separate air-line subsidies from compensation for the cost of carrying air mail. The subsidy portion, if any, should be paid through a separate appropriation rather than as presently handled through the appropriation for the Post Office Department.

The items in this bill for the Federal judiciary provide for the expenses of operating all of the Federal courts, including the salaries and expenses of judges and other necessary employees, salaries and expenses of bankruptcy referees, the cost of the probation system, and repair and upkeep of Federal court buildings and grounds.

The committee was advised that the disposition of criminal cases in the Federal courts continues to be expeditious. Thirty-six thousand one hundred and nine criminal cases were disposed of in 1950 compared with 36,383 filed, leaving pending 8,181 cases. When allowance is made for cases pending in which the defendants are fugitives or are serving sentences on other charges, it is estimated that the backlog of criminal cases represents approximately 2 months' work for the courts. With reference to civil cases the condition is somewhat different. There were 53,259 cases disposed of in 1950, an increase of nearly 5,000 over 1949. The number of civil cases disposed of was 1,363 less than the number begun during 1950 with the result that the backlog of civil cases was increased to 55,603 at the end of the year.

I take it that when we get to the point of reading this bill for amendment there will be two principal items of disagreement. One will be the item referred to during debate on the rule today by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and concerns the Voice of America.

As I pointed out at that time, I have been a long-time constructive critic of the operations of the Voice of America. I have criticized it for the purpose of making it better and more effective. But I am thoroughly in accord with the thought that we must have a strong and efficient information service. I would be prepared to vote an appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 to meet the Soviet expenditure for the same purpose, provided I know we are going to get a dollar's worth for a dollar.

This bill has been substantially reduced insofar as the Voice of America is concerned, from \$115,000,000 to \$85,000,000. But I do not believe in curing a patient who has a sore throat by cutting his head off, which is the philosophy advanced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown]. I want a better information service and Voice of America. I want it to get better and better.

With regard to all this criticism we have heard today concerning broadcasts of the Voice of America, let me point out that complete scripts of the broadcasts are furnished members of the Committee on Appropriations and other Members of the House regularly by the State Department. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber] and his investigator, Mr. Lee, are causing my eyesight to become impaired reading scripts. I have an arrangement with the Department whereby if a Member asks them for a script another copy is sent to me, so that I may examine it to find out whether or not there may be some just criticism of it. On some days I find piles of broadcasting scripts this high on my desk.

Now that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Taber] has all the scripts he has asked for, I am looking forward to some statements during this debate from the other side alleging those scripts broadcast during the past year which they find fault with. They have the scripts. Let them produce them and let us see what is wrong, if anything, with those scripts.

The other matter or item concerning which we may be in disagreement is the matter of unconstitutionally inserting in this bill a rider or amendment which would deny his lawful salary to the present Secretary of State. Back on the 14th of May last I noted an article in the Washington Star captioned "GOP weighs plans for forcing Acheson out of Cabinet post." It alleged that—

Representative PHILLIPS, Republican, of California, today came up with a new strategy for House Republicans seeking to force Dean Acheson out of office as Secretary of State.

Such a campaign has been under discussion in House cloak rooms for several weeks.

Mr. PHILLIPS, a member of the Appropriations Committee, has drafted an amendment which would strike Mr. Acheson from the State Department payroll without mentioning him by name. Attempts to eliminate individuals by name have been blocked in the past by court rulings.

Let me here interpose the fact that whether or not you mention an individual by name, the gentleman from California's amendment would be a bill of attainder, prohibited by article I, section 9, of the Constitution of the United States. It was so held in the case of



*United States v. Lovett* (328 U. S. 303) some 4 or 5 years ago by the United States Supreme Court.

In the Lovett case the question for decision was the validity of a strikingly similar statutory provision: section 304 of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1943 provided that—

No part of any appropriation, allocation, or fund (1) which is made available under or pursuant to this act, or (2) which is now, or which is hereafter made, available under or pursuant to any other act, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, shall be used \* \* \* to pay any part of the salary, or other compensation for the personal services, of three named Federal officials.

The three named employees were continued in their jobs, but, when their pay was withheld after the effective date of the provision, the three brought suit for their pay in the Court of Claims. The Court of Claims found for plaintiffs on the theory that the statutory provision was merely intended to preclude the payment of salaries out of general appropriations, and was not intended to prevent the United States from paying its contractual obligations for services rendered by the three plaintiffs at the instance of the United States—One Hundred and Fourth Court Claims, page 557; Sixty-sixth Federal Supplement, page 142.

On certiorari, the Supreme Court recognized, on the basis of legislative history, that it was the clear intent of Congress to terminate all Federal compensation for the three Federal officials. Accordingly, the Supreme Court found itself squarely confronted with three grave constitutional questions:

First, whether the statute violated article I, section 9 of the Constitution, which provides that "No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed";

Second, whether the statute was an unconstitutional infringement of the executive prerogative to remove officials of the executive arm of the Government;

Third, whether the statute violated the due-process clause of the fifth amendment.

The Supreme Court held section 304 to be a bill of attainder within the meaning of article I, section 9, of the Constitution. Accordingly, as the Court stated:

Much as we regret to declare that an act of Congress violates the Constitution, we have no alternative here (328 U. S. at 318).

In brief, the Court held in the Lovett case that to deprive a specifically designated person of his Federal office "is punishment, and of a most severe type"—Three Hundred and Twenty-eighth United States Reports at page 316. And punishment, as the Court made clear, must, under the American constitutional system, be imposed by the courts and not by legislatures.

The precedents on which the Court relied amply demonstrate the traditional Anglo-American abhorrence for bills of attainder. Thus, in the historic case of *Cummings v. Missouri* (71 U. S. 277 1866), the Supreme Court invalidated—as bills of attainder and ex post facto laws—provisions of the post-Civil War Missouri constitution which forbade

priests and clergymen from practicing their callings unless they took a test oath swearing that they had not in the past been associated in any way with enemies of the United States. And in the companion case of *Ex parte Garland* (71 U. S. 333), the Supreme Court struck down a Federal statute closing the courts of the United States to all lawyers who failed to take a similar test oath.

In framing his proposed amendment, the gentleman from California has attempted to conceal the clear object of the legislation by not naming Secretary Acheson directly. But the device attempted is wholly ineffective from a constitutional standpoint. It is true that in the Lovett case the challenged statute explicitly named the three men who were the targets of the legislation. But the Court's opinion in the Lovett case makes clear that the presence or absence of the names was immaterial to the decision:

Legislative acts, no matter what their form, that apply either to named individuals or to clearly ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment on them without a judicial trial are bills of attainder prohibited by the Constitution (328 U. S. at 315-316).

And it is to be noted that Mr. Justice Frankfurter, who did not agree that the statute was a bill of attainder but who concurred on the theory adopted by the Court of Claims, also expressly noted that under the *Cummings* and *Garland* decisions the presence of the name of the legislative target is immaterial:

That the persons legislatively punished were not named was a mere detail of identification (328 U. S. 327).

Recognition that the wording of the enactment cannot be permitted to obscure its constitutional invalidity is underscored by the gentleman's remarks about his original proposal, reported in the *Washington Star* for May 14, 1951:

To name the individual could be construed as a bill of attainder and therefore illegal. By not naming Acheson, but by approving a limitation such as I have proposed, we would accomplish the same result.

The complete answer to this attempt to circumvent the Constitution is provided by the language of the Supreme Court in the *Cummings* case:

If the clauses of the second article of the Constitution of Missouri, to which we have referred, had in terms declared that Mr. Cummings was guilty, or should be held guilty, of having been in armed hostility to the United States, or of having entered that State to avoid being enrolled or drafted into the military service of the United States, and, therefore, should be deprived of the right to preach as a priest of the Catholic Church, or to teach in any institution of learning, there could be no question that the clauses would constitute a bill of attainder within the meaning of the Federal Constitution. If these clauses, instead of mentioning his name, had declared that all priests and clergymen within the State of Missouri were guilty of these acts, or should be held guilty of them, and hence be subjected to the like deprivation, the clauses would be equally open to objection. And, further, if these clauses had declared that all such priests and clergymen should be so held guilty, and be thus deprived, provided they did not, by a day designated,

do certain specified acts, they would be no less within the inhibition of the Federal Constitution.

In all these cases there would be the legislative enactment creating the deprivation without any of the ordinary forms and guards provided for the security of the citizen in the administration of justice by the established tribunals.

The results which would follow from clauses of the character mentioned do follow from the clauses actually adopted. The difference between the last case supposed and the case actually presented is one of form only, and not of substance. The existing clauses presume the guilt of the priests and clergymen, and adjudge the deprivation of their right to preach or teach unless the presumption be first removed by their expurgatory oath—in other words, they assume the guilt and adjudge the punishment conditionally. The clauses supposed differ only in that they declare the guilt instead of assuming it. The deprivation is effected with equal certainty in the one case as it would be in the other, but not with equal directness. The purpose of the lawmaker in the case supposed would be openly avowed; in the case existing it is only disguised. The legal result must be the same, for what cannot be done directly cannot be done indirectly. The Constitution deals with substance, not shadows. Its inhibition was leveled at the thing, not the name. It intended that the rights of the citizen should be secure against deprivation for past conduct by legislative enactment, under any form, however disguised. If the inhibition can be evaded by the form of the enactment, its insertion in the fundamental law was a vain and futile proceeding (71 U. S. at 324-325).

It is clear that, under the ruling in the Lovett case, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California—in its original or its revised form—would be a bill of attainder. In its original form, as quoted above, it clearly imposes punishment on "easily ascertainable members of a group." Because the "group" turned out to be larger than the gentleman supposed, he is now narrowing his aim and pin-pointing the invalidity of his amendment by defining the "group" to include only Secretary Acheson.

The proposed amendment poses grave constitutional questions quite aside from its characteristics as a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law.

The additional questions raised but not decided in the Lovett case are equally pertinent here—whether such a provision violates due process and whether it encroaches on the executive power.

These two issues, as Mr. Justice Frankfurter recognized in his concurrence in the Lovett case, are "serious constitutional questions"—Three Hundred and Twenty-eighth United States Reports, pages 327-328—questions which go to the heart of our constitutional system.

The due-process issue raises grave questions as to the reasonableness of imposing limitations on State Department officers, or on the Secretary of State alone, which are not applicable to any other officer of the Federal Government.

The question of encroachment on the Executive power presents the converse of the issues raised in *Humphrey's Executor v. United States* (295 U. S. 602 (1935)), in which the Supreme Court, limiting the rule of *Myers v. United States* (272 U. S. 52 (1926)), held that the President was powerless to discharge a member of the Federal Trade Com-



mission except for cause defined in advance by Congress. For, as the Court there pointed out:

The fundamental necessity of maintaining each of the three general departments of Government entirely free from the control or coercive influence, direct or indirect, of either of the others, has often been stressed and is hardly open to serious question. So much is implied in the very fact of the separation of the powers of these departments by the Constitution; and in the rule which recognizes their essential co-equality. The sound application of a principle that makes one master in his own house precludes him from imposing his control in the house of another who is master there (295 U. S. 629-630).

In this connection, I believe most Members of the House have seen the newspaper cartoon I have here. It is from the front page of the Washington Star of July 11. It shows an ample gentleman in the process of firing a hefty blunderbuss into the woods. The ample gentleman is labeled "House Republicans," and the blunderbuss is called the "Phillips amendment."

As the blunderbuss goes off with a stupendous blast, a number of little elephants come scurrying out of the woods. The elephants, understandably, have an expression of stark fear on their chubby faces—as would any animal running for its life, political or otherwise. These elephants are labeled "GOP jobholders."

Now, this cartoon would appear to be all wrong—for no gentleman labeled "House Republicans" is going to wander around firing a blunderbuss at Republican office holders. But what straightens everything out is what the blunderbuss-firing gentleman is saying. He is saying, "I was firing at Dean Acheson."

Well, it did not take long for the blunderbuss-toting gentleman to find out that you just do not go hunting for an Acheson that way. It is dangerous. Very dangerous. You might—just might—hit what you are aiming at, but in the process you are going to kill off a lot of your kith and kin.

Well, as I said, it did not take long for the blunderbuss shooter to discover this—after a lot of expert hunters pointed it out to him.

But our blunderbuss shooter is on a hunting spree now, and nothing is going to put him off. So what does he do? He puts up his blunderbuss and gets himself a sharpshooter's rifle. Now he will go hunting for an Acheson—for an Acheson and nothing else.

But whether with blunderbuss or rifle the ample gentleman is no fair hunter. First of all, a hunter obeys the laws. The supreme law of the land specifically says you cannot hunt and shoot an Acheson—or any other similar game—with such a sharpshooting rifle as the hunter has now taken into his hands. He has no license for such hunting.

He would ask us, in effect, to break the law and give him a special license to go out and shoot an Acheson.

Now, hunting, whether in the field or in politics, has its points. But it also has its rules. Our blunderbuss shooter now turned sharpshooter knows these rules only too well. He knows the law

provides excellent rules for the tapping and shooting of every sort of political game. Let him obey the law.

You can imagine what would happen if we gave our hunter a license. Why, the woods would be so full of inept game-shooters that before long they would be a menace not only to everything in the field but to themselves as well.

No, this House cannot issue such an illegal license—either for blunderbuss shooters or sharpshooters. Acheson-hunting may be a vote-getting sport for our ample hunting gentleman, but he will have to do his hunting under the legal rules and with the legal weapons of the land.

Better still, it would be healthier for all of us if our eager huntsman would take up fishing in quiet waters.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes, and I now yield to the gentleman from California, whose name I mentioned.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for not yielding to me before, because I would have missed that those very interesting remarks.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The quotation you read from the paper was not mine. I just wanted to tell you that.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder if the gentleman would point out in what respect it was not his, and what his ideas on this subject are.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Briefly, because it will come up at the proper time. The quotation which said, "Get Acheson," was never mine.

Mr. ROONEY. You would not attempt to do such a thing?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not directly, no.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman for his frankness.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Only on the basis of principle, which I think is involved, and which will come up in an amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman care to explain to us what sort of an amendment he proposes?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. At the proper time, I shall be glad to. Never at any time were the long list of names, 37 in all, ever affected.

Mr. ROONEY. We shall see whether or not that is so when we get to the proper time. The amendment that was proposed by the gentleman, according to the newspapers, would not only get Dean Acheson. It would get John Foster Dulles. It would get our distinguished ambassador in Madrid. It would probably get our ambassador in London, Walter S. Gifford. It would get Thomas D. Cabot, Geoffrey Parsons, Richard Patterson and many others, many of whom are of the same Republican faith as the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not know why the gentleman is carrying on such a one-sided argument. They were never in the list. That was a fishing expedition on the part of the State Department, and

characteristic of the State Department, I might say.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman, before I yield the floor to whom-ever it was that asked me to yield next, that we will get to that at the proper time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. What I have to discuss is one of the minor provisions of the bill, that affects people in my area. On page 10 of the report there is a paragraph on salaries and expenses for claims of persons of Japanese ancestry. The item that is awarded for that purpose for payment of claims is \$500,000. Why have the administrative expenses for processing those claims been so high in proportion to the amount paid?

Mr. ROONEY. That has been one of the complaints of the committee. The committee, if the gentleman will read the printed hearings on this subject, has been highly critical for some time of the delay in processing these claims of persons of Japanese ancestry; and may I say to the gentleman from California that every member of this committee—I believe that is a fair statement, if it is not the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVELAND] may correct me—is in sympathy with the thought of the gentleman from California that we should promptly and expeditiously dispose of these claims, most of which I would say are fair and equitable and arise from hurried displacement of these folks from their homes in California and on the west coast.

Mr. JOHNSON. I have read the testimony in full. It covers about three pages. I notice that the gentleman from New York was the one who did the questioning and brought out the various points involved in the problem. But one question I want to ask the gentleman is this: Do you think that the basic law that lays down the right of these people to make claims is too ambiguous or too broad? The reason I ask that question is that Mr. Clapp, I think that was the name of the gentleman, complained that it was very hard to determine just what the criteria were which a claimant must present. He also mentioned the fact that many of the claimants cannot talk the English language. I think it is up to the claimants to furnish the interpreter, either relatives or interpreters, to make their claim.

Mr. ROONEY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON. They should not saddle that cost onto the Government. What does the gentleman think about the law itself, the basic act? Should it be amended?

Mr. ROONEY. As of the time of these hearings, if my memory serves me right, there was a discussion regarding prompt disposition of all claims up to \$2,500; in other words, permission to the Department of Justice to go out and expeditiously pay off a claimant up to that amount. Such a bill was passed by the



House last June 4 and is H. R. 3142, now pending in the other body. It would permit prompt claims adjustment and save a great deal of administrative detail and a great deal of time, would be fair to the claimant, and at the same time fair to the taxpayers.

Mr. JOHNSON. But the Attorney General is reluctant to make decisions because he does not seem to have a clear-cut conception of the purpose of the law, and does not seem to know just what it is that a claimant must present to support his claim.

Mr. ROONEY. I must say to the gentleman from California that that is a matter that must be handled by the legislative committee. As the gentleman from California knows, I always believed in the proposition that the Committee on Appropriations should never legislate and should not take over the prerogatives of the legislative committees.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am thinking of drafting an amendment to clarify the procedure a claimant must follow to present a claim, and I wanted to get the gentleman's views on the problem.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know that my testimony of the moment would have any weight with the legislative committee; as a matter of fact, I do not know that I have the authority of this subcommittee to go into that subject. We are concerned primarily with the payment of adjudicated claims; we must furnish money according to the basic law, to pay these claims.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. We must furnish the money to pay the claims but we are not in a position to adjudicate them.

Mr. JOHNSON. But the law should be plain so that the Administrator could know just what kind of claims he should pay.

Mr. ROONEY. I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. JOHNSON. I notice that the committee gave only \$500,000 for the payment of these claims, yet the estimated amount of these claims, stated by the chief witness, aggregated \$131,000,000.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say to the gentleman from California that we allowed every penny of the amount requested by the chief witness for the payment of these claims. The amount requested was \$500,000, and we provided every dime of it.

Mr. JOHNSON. At that rate it would take over 200 years to pay these claims, and most of the people making these claims are aged people now.

Mr. ROONEY. There may be some question of the validity of the information which the gentleman has with regard to the amount involved and the number of claims.

Mr. JOHNSON. It is in the record there; I read it. The gentleman tried to get the essential information, I know.

Mr. ROONEY. We allowed every penny presently requested for payment of the claims.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. On pages 4 and 5 of the report I notice that con-

tributions to international organizations are set at \$29,300,000; and on page 5 you indicate a certain reduction by percentages.

Mr. ROONEY. No; we do not. We do not attempt to itemize the reductions in our report, I must say to the gentleman; we merely point out at page 5 certain reductions made by the Department of State and the international organizations.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Do I understand the State Department takes this amount, then allocates it to the various organizations? The point I would like to make is this: How much did we contribute to UN last year, or what will our contribution be to UN and UNESCO and to world health organizations?

Mr. ROONEY. Last year our share of the United Nations was \$13,576,243, our share of UNESCO was \$2,814,381, and our share of WHO was \$3,070,931. For 1952 the contemplated American share of UN is \$16,394,244, our share of UNESCO, \$2,785,400, and of WHO, \$2,481,159.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the statement at page 5 of the committee report with regard to reductions in the United States share to UNESCO has been changed since the printing of our report. On the 11th of July, I am informed, UNESCO further reduced the American share to 33 1/3 percent.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I will be glad to have the figures in the RECORD and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. On this matter of Federal aid to the airport program, has the gentleman's committee done anything about reviewing the expenditures for aid to the various projects?

Mr. ROONEY. We have investigated and found some irregularities, which I believe are pointed out in this report, in regard to three airports down in Louisiana; but as far as examination concerning every airport in America is concerned, I must say to the gentleman we have not done that.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Did the question of the Burke Airport come up?

Mr. ROONEY. Not at all. There is no question about the Burke Airport in this bill. We do not select airports for the Federal aid to airport program.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is there any money in this appropriation that will carry out the Burke Airport.

Mr. ROONEY. There is no money in this, with which the committee is concerned, for Burke Airport. This committee does not select airport sites. CAA does.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I appreciate that.

Mr. ROONEY. We studiously avoid that, as a matter of common sense. As

the gentleman can appreciate, if we came in here with recommendations, those who were left out would not be in too good humor about going along with the others. We leave that in the hands of the Executive. They set up the airport program for fiscal year 1952, which we will be glad to show the gentleman. All of the proposed airports are set out in it.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Regardless of whether there might be any duplication of existing facilities or not?

Mr. ROONEY. That is a matter for the Congress generally.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. During the course of the gentleman's discussion, I wish he would go into rather detailed discussion about the housing situation that we have read so much about over in Germany, Frankfurt, and other places.

Mr. STEFAN. I will be glad to do that. I think the best place to do that would be under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I just want to remind the gentleman that it should be thoroughly discussed.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, in presenting the bill making annual appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, and the Federal Judiciary, we of the minority wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable JOHN ROONEY, of New York, and the other members of the majority membership of the subcommittee—the Honorable DAN FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; the Honorable PRINCE PRESTON, of Georgia; and the Honorable FRED MARSHALL, of Minnesota—for their courtesy, fine cooperation, and nonpartisan spirit during all of our deliberations. I also wish to commend the very able and efficient executive secretary of the subcommittee, Mr. Jay Howe, for his excellent services.

This bill comes to you with some reservations on the part of the minority and, for the first time in some years, it reaches you without a unanimous report. We are pleased that substantial reductions have been made in some of the items. With that action we agree. We are in disagreement on some other items which will be the basis for amendments we are prepared to offer when the bill is read for amendment.

There has been so much said and so much printed about one of the departments affected by the bill—the Department of State—that I am impelled to discuss that agency in some detail. I have prepared charts which should give the membership a better picture of the problem as related to appropriations and the results obtained over a period of years. While the hearings on this bill are complete and should be read by every Member who is interested in the condi-



tion of our ship of state, these hearings are voluminous and contain statistics and figures that are sometimes confusing. Therefore, I felt the charts I now present will simplify the picture and perhaps answer some of the questions that are in your minds.

First of all, I should inform the House that the Congress over a period of 10 or 11 years has or will have appropriated for the Department of State \$2,000,000,000. In 1942 appropriations for this Department totaled about \$37,500,000. In 1938 the Department had 5,000 positions and the appropriations totaled \$19,600,000. The request of this same Department for 1952 was \$283,500,000 and the subcommittee has allowed \$236,400,000. The request was for 28,738 permanent positions. The Congress has not been niggardly with appropriations and enabling legislation for this Department.

The first chart I wish to show to the House at this time is numbered chart 4, furnished to me by the Department of State. It indicates that 28,738 is the total number of persons for which the Department requested. As you will note in the first line on this chart under the heading "Number of permanent positions," the request was for 14,191, or 49.4 percent for the Department proper. In comparison, the request for the Voice of America, or what is known as International Information and Education Activities, was for 13,518, or 47 percent of all the permanent positions of the entire Department of State. Knowledge all the permanent positions of the enable you to know that, contrary to many statements, the Congress has been generous with the Voice of America. The other figures on this chart show the numbers of personnel in other divisions of the Department which add up to the total requested number of permanent positions of 28,738.

#### APPROPRIATIONS

Chart No. 2, which I present to you at this time, shows all of the Department of State 1952 appropriation estimates beginning with salaries and expenses of the Department of State proper of \$77,400,000, or 27.3 percent of the total requested, which amounts to \$283,566,476. Representation allowance request is a million dollars; Foreign Service retirement is \$4,627,000; acquisition of buildings abroad is \$9,000,000; emergencies in diplomatic and consular service was \$19,900,000, which has been reduced to \$9,900,000; contributions to international organizations is \$30,684,476, or over 10 percent of the total and which item is growing because of authorizations made by the Congress. The next item, missions to international organizations, is \$1,570,000, is showing some increase due to legislation passed by the Congress. The International Boundary and Water Commission of \$17,450,000, or a little over 6 percent of the total, is largely confined to the activities on the Mexican border. The next item of salaries and expenses of American sections to international commissions of \$870,000 is almost uncontrollable in view of the continued legislation passed by the Congress. However, I call your at-

tention to the International Information and Education Activities, or the Voice of America's request of \$115,000,000, which is 40.6 percent of the total request for the entire State Department as compared with the 27.3 percent for the Department of State proper. It should be made clear at this time that for fiscal year 1951 International Information and Education Activities, or the Voice of America, has had appropriations of \$121,000,000, including supplements and, I understand, a request for another \$90,000,000 is being made in another body for the same agency. So you can readily see that the appropriations for this agency have been exceedingly large.

To emphasize the rapid growth in appropriations for the Department of State, I present a table by years showing that the appropriations for the Department jumped from \$37,433,519 in 1942 to \$273,947,086 in 1951 which, with a request for \$283,566,476 in 1952, is nearly \$2,000,000,000 over a period of 11 years. The table of these appropriations follows:

| Appropriations by year for Department of State |               |
|------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1942-----                                      | \$37,433,519  |
| 1943-----                                      | 63,044,558    |
| 1944-----                                      | 65,068,008    |
| 1945-----                                      | 58,981,438    |
| 1946-----                                      | 101,514,296   |
| 1947-----                                      | 187,097,922   |
| 1948-----                                      | 311,686,535   |
| 1949-----                                      | 285,620,148   |
| 1950-----                                      | 279,345,656   |
| 1951-----                                      | 273,947,086   |
| 1952 (request)-----                            | 283,566,476   |
| Total-----                                     | 1,952,305,642 |

On a functional or appropriation basis these amounts for this same period are as follows:

|                                                   |               |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| Salaries and expenses-----                        | \$629,139,565 |
| Representation allowance-----                     | 6,095,000     |
| Foreign Service retirement-----                   | 16,051,400    |
| Building fund-----                                | 114,439,000   |
| Emergencies in service-----                       | 118,125,000   |
| Contributions to international organizations----- | 396,849,396   |
| Missions to international organizations-----      | 10,528,115    |
| International contingencies-----                  | 25,250,000    |
| International Boundary and Water Commission-----  | 8,240,228     |
| Construction, international-----                  | 36,691,960    |
| Rio Grande flood protection-----                  | 320,100       |
| American Sections, International Commission-----  | 4,101,274     |
| International Claims Commission-----              | 505,000       |
| International information, etc-----               | 361,434,606   |
| Philippine rehabilitation-----                    | 142,083,398   |
| Institute of Inter-American Affairs-----          | 82,351,600    |
| Total-----                                        | 1,952,305,642 |

I must remind the House that these figures do not include all the foreign-aid appropriations, which total close to \$100,000,000,000. This will be supplemented by a bill not yet written and which, we are informed, will total \$8,500,000,000, and will come to this House in the near future.

We are told that our objective is to fight Communist aggression, no matter where it breaks out in the world. Whether or not our appropriations have been effective in this respect I leave to your judgment, after I explain charts that

indicate the rapid advance of communism in the world.

#### SPREAD OF COMMUNISM

Chart 1, World Communism on the March, shows that in 1950 the Communists' slice of the world pie is one-fifth of the total land area of the world. Within this great land area one-third of the world's total population is beneath the yoke of communism. This chart points up Stalin's statement, made in Foundation of Leninism, that—

The revolution is spreading beyond the confines of one country. The epoch of world revolution has commenced.

Chart 2, Communist World Strength, shows that there are 25,000,000 Communist Party members in the total world population. As depicted by the human symbols, there is 1 party member to every 90 nonmembers. I wish to point out that the Communist Party members are all staunch, ardent, well-indoctrinated adults—the hard core of the party—whereas the balance of the world population considered for statistical purposes includes infants, children, the aged, and infirm; persons of all beliefs and creeds, and so forth. The Communists' true strength is actually far greater than the ratio of 1 to 90. It has been estimated that Communist Party fellow travelers, while not party members, do support the party's aims and programs and actually increase party strength tenfold, or to a total of 250,000,000 persons in sympathy with Communist Party aims. The role of the American Communist is explained in the statement by Stalin included in the chart. He said:

A word or two regarding the tasks and the mission of the American Communist Party. I think, comrades, that the American Communist Party is one of those few Communist Parties in the world upon which history has laid tasks of a decisive character from the point of view of the world revolutionary movement.

Chart 3, Percent of World Population Under Communist Control, shows that in 1939, depicted by the small slice of the world pie, the Communists controlled 7.9 percent, or 170,467,186 of the world population, as compared to 1950, where the slice has grown to 34.4 percent, or 779,458,938 of the world population. While in 1939 their control was exercised in the U. S. S. R., by 1950 their iron curtain has swept over 14 countries. It should be noted that the satellite nations have been brought under the control of the U. S. S. R. since World War II, or August 1945. A statement by William Z. Foster implies by what methods communism has grown. He said:

The French and Italian Communist Parties have clearly stated their determination not to fight against the U. S. S. R. Our American party has done likewise.

Chart 4, The Growth of World Communism, shows the growth of the Communist Party in a 33-year span, which from 80,000 Bolsheviks located within Russia in 1917 became the international colossus of today embracing 25,000,000 members throughout the world. The human symbol for today is 312.5 times greater than the small silhouette of 1917. The chart further sets forth a



statement by Lenin regarding the necessity of revolution and Stalin's statement that the revolution of America is nearly at hand. Lenin said:

The substitution of the proletarian state for the bourgeois state is impossible without a violent revolution.

Stalin said:

I think the moment is not far off when a revolutionary crisis will develop in America. And when a revolutionary crisis develops in America that will be the beginning of the end of world capitalism, as a whole.

Again it should be remembered that the true strength of the Communist Party is 10 times the amount of the actual membership.

We of the free world are taking a terrific beating. Money alone will not solve this grave problem. It is a problem which was never faced or even imagined by our founding fathers. This problem demands men of the quality of those who laid the original foundation of our Republic.

#### HISTORY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. Chairman, General MacArthur has stated that the Yalu River, boundary between Korea and Manchuria, is the first line of defense of these United States.

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt stated that the Rhine River of Germany was the first line of defense of these United States.

I say to you that the first line of defense for these United States once was—and it is still possible for it to be—a strong, patriotic, well-manned, well-trained, well-led, and purposeful American Department of State. Our State Department can have all of these attributes. It must have them, if this Nation is to survive.

Our State Department can be strong because it has been strong.

God gave this Nation experienced statesmen to guide us through our national infancy.

Benjamin Franklin, our first professional Foreign Service officer, had had some 15 years of service as the representative of the political and economic interests of the Thirteen Colonies before the outbreak of the Revolutionary War.

Franklin was associated with the Committee on Secret Correspondence of the Continental Congress as its chairman. As such, he and his associates forged a chain of European powers friendly to the Colonies about embattled England.

After the Declaration of Independence on the 4th of July 1776 a Committee for Foreign Affairs was established. This committee worked with the Committee on Secret Correspondence by keeping American agents abroad informed on domestic developments at home.

Thus, at the beginning of our national life, our foreign affairs were not only a concern of Congress, they were a part of Congress.

It was not until 1781 that a Department of Foreign Affairs was created—and that Department was expressly created to act as an executive arm of Congress.

The first Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Robert R. Livingston, received an annual

salary of \$4,000. His staff consisted of a First Under Secretary at \$800 a year; a Second Under Secretary at \$700 a year; a clerk-translator at \$500 a year; and a clerk at \$500 a year. These expenditures, together with rental of business offices and purchase of pens, ink and paper, constituted the entire expenses of Mr. Livingston's Department, since American representatives abroad paid their own way from fees for visa stamping and like services.

John Jay succeeded Robert Livingston as Secretary of Foreign Affairs. He held that office until 1790—after the ratification of the Constitution—at which time he turned the portfolio over to Thomas Jefferson. Our relations with other nations were maintained, by act of Congress in July 1789, by a Department of Foreign Affairs. It was not until September of 1789 that the name of this branch of the executive was changed to the Department of State.

This Department of State was a rallying point for statesmen. The finest minds, the most patriotic hearts, in the new Republic were attracted to the Department.

Eight Americans—later to be President of the United States—were diplomatic representatives of the American people abroad.

John Adams, the second President, represented us in France in 1778 and in the Netherlands and Great Britain between 1780 and 1788.

Thomas Jefferson, the third President, represented us in France between 1784 and 1789, serving for four of those years as United States Minister.

James Monroe, the fifth President, represented us in France from 1794 to 1796 and in Great Britain from 1803 to 1807.

John Quincy Adams, the sixth President, represented us in the Netherlands from 1794 to 1797, in Prussia from 1797 to 1801, in Russia from 1809 to 1814, and in Great Britain from 1815 to 1817.

Martin Van Buren, the eighth President, represented us in Great Britain in 1831 and 1832.

William Henry Harrison, the ninth President, represented us in Colombia in 1828 and 1829.

James Buchanan, the fifteenth President, represented us in Russia in 1832 and 1833 and in Great Britain in 1853 to 1856.

Nor are these the only names of great patriots, great thinkers, great Americans who, so very early, made our State Department so very strong. On the roster of early Secretaries of State are these proud names: Edmund Randolph, Timothy Pickering, John Marshall, James Madison, Henry Clay, Edward Livingston, Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Edward Everett, and Lewis Cass.

Our consular service rivaled the heads of missions in the first half of the nineteenth century for the courage, the brilliance, the devotion to the interests of the United States for which Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe are so justly renowned.

The consular arm of our diplomatic public servants began in 1780 when Col. William Palfrey, of Massachusetts, was

chosen by the Continental Congress to be consul to France.

From the very outset, our consular service was a challenge for the best Americans to exert their finest efforts.

William Eaton, consul of Tunis from 1797 to 1803, is enshrined in American history and romance. His adventures have recently been filmed as a motion picture. It was Eaton who led an army of some 600 Arabs, Greeks, Italians, and others 500 miles across the desert to capture Derna from the Barbary pirates.

Our early consuls knew the America they served.

Washington Irving, consul to Spain from 1826 to 1829, knew his beloved America so well that he wrote *Rip Van Winkle*.

Poinsett, botanist and military expert, was our first Ambassador to Mexico. In that country, he developed the flower which today bears his name and which has a high place among gifts exchanged at Christmas. He knew his America so well that he gave us a flower to admire.

John Howard Payne, consul at Tunis from 1842 to 1845, loved his America so well that he composed the immortal *Home, Sweet Home*.

Nathaniel Hawthorne, who captured the living spirit of New England, was consul at Liverpool from 1853 to 1857.

William Dean Howells, editor and novelist, was consul at Venice from 1861 to 1865.

Historian George Bancroft, often called father of the United States Naval Academy, served as United States Minister in London and Berlin.

John Lothrop Motley, another great historian—author of *The Rise of the Dutch Republic* and *The United Netherlands*, served in Russia, Austria, and England.

James Russell Lowell, outstanding among the literary men of America and the world, was Minister to Spain from 1877 to 1880 and Minister to Great Britain from 1880 to 1885.

Nor is this an end to the renowned and respected names that raised our State Department to a position of monumental power among the people and the rulers of every nation of their time.

But the State Department, for whom these men labored, did not grow by leaps and bounds although it had been made a catch-all for many domestic functions as well as for the original foreign affairs function for which it had been created.

The Department kept the records of the Government. It issued patents and copyrights. It prepared the census publications. It received applications for pardons. It handled territorial affairs. It issued commercial reports.

Yet, in the 30 years between 1790 and 1820 it grew only from the Secretary and five clerks in 1790 to the Secretary and eleven clerks and three messengers in 1820. The consuls, ministers, and special representatives abroad supported themselves from the various fees of office.

The increase in the size of the State Department was not a nineteenth-century phenomena.



By 1870, the year of the Franco-Prussian War, the Department had increased its staff only to the number of 31 officers. Intelligent, sincere, dedicated, patriotic men did not need numbers to accomplish results.

Congress was satisfied. From the first congressional definition of the duties of American consuls in 1792 there was no significant congressional movement for change in the Foreign Service until 1855. The act of 1856 remained the organic act for the Foreign Service for more than half a century. That act established the salaries of ministers at \$10,000, \$12,000, and \$17,500 per year, a scale which remained unchanged until 1946. It also authorized the appointment of salaried secretaries of legation; and it placed some consuls—although still not all of them—on a salary basis.

In 1906 Congress completely reorganized the consular service. This reorganization was followed by a series of several Executive orders to put the will of Congress into effect.

The act of 1915 expressed the desire of Congress to put the entire Foreign Service, below the rank of minister, on a merit basis. It authorized the assignment of any diplomatic secretary or consul to temporary service in the Department of State without loss of grade, class, or salary.

The Rogers Act of 1924 was designed to create a modern Foreign Service. It provided for merit alone as the basis for appointment and promotion. It fixed a new salary scale. It combined the diplomatic and consular services into a unified Foreign Service.

The Linthicum-Moses Act of 1931 was an effort by Congress to improve on and correct some defects in the Rogers Act. In effect, however, there were no major changes in the over-all operation of the Foreign Service between the time of the Rogers Act and the act of 1946, under which the Department functions, for the most part, today.

While there have been few legislative changes in the State Department during the twentieth century there have been many administrative changes. When Secretary Fish reorganized the Department in 1870, there were 16 separate units of an administrative nature in the Department. In 1913—43 years after that particular reorganization—there were still only 23 separate administrative units in the Department: an increase of only 7 in 43 years.

James L. McCamy, professor of political science, University of Wisconsin, presents the rate of increase of administrative units in the State Department graphically in a table on page 49 of his book, *The Administration of American Foreign Affairs*—Knopf, 1950:

Separate and distinct units or organization in specific year, Department of State

| Year:     | Separate units |
|-----------|----------------|
| 1870..... | 16             |
| 1913..... | 23             |
| 1918..... | 26             |
| 1922..... | 30             |
| 1931..... | 36             |
| 1943..... | 62             |
| 1944..... | 94             |
| 1948..... | 113            |

Mr. Chairman, at this point, I should like to insert a chronological list of the Secretaries of State, an overwhelming majority of whom patriotically contributed toward making the Department of State the first line of defense of a strong United States of America:

Secretaries of State

| President            | Secretary                         | Date of appointment |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Washington.....      | 1. Thomas Jefferson.....          | 1789                |
|                      | 2. Edmund Randolph.....           | 1794                |
|                      | 3. Timothy Pickens.....           | 1795                |
|                      | 4. Timothy Pickens.....           | 1797                |
| Adams.....           | 5. John Marshall.....             | 1800                |
|                      | 6. James Madison.....             | 1801                |
|                      | 7. Robert Smith.....              | 1809                |
| Jefferson.....       | 8. James Monroe.....              | 1811                |
|                      | 9. John Q. Adams.....             | 1817                |
| Madison.....         | 10. Henry Clay.....               | 1825                |
| Monroe.....          | 11. Martin Van Buren.....         | 1829                |
|                      | 12. Edward Livingston.....        | 1831                |
| J. Q. Adams.....     | 13. Louis McLane.....             | 1833                |
|                      | 14. John Forsyth.....             | 1834                |
| Jackson.....         | 15. John Forsyth.....             | 1837                |
| Van Buren.....       | 16. Daniel Webster.....           | 1841                |
|                      | 17. Daniel Webster.....           | 1841                |
| W. H. Harrison.....  | 18. Hugh S. Legaré.....           | 1843                |
| Tyler.....           | 19. Abel P. Upshur.....           | 1843                |
|                      | 20. John C. Calhoun.....          | 1844                |
| Polk.....            | 21. James Buchanan.....           | 1845                |
|                      | 22. John M. Clayton.....          | 1849                |
| Taylor.....          | 23. Daniel Webster.....           | 1850                |
| Fillmore.....        | 24. Edward Everett.....           | 1852                |
|                      | 25. William I. Marcy.....         | 1853                |
| Pierce.....          | 26. Lewis Cass.....               | 1857                |
|                      | 27. Jeremiah Black.....           | 1860                |
| Buchanan.....        | 28. William H. Seward.....        | 1861                |
|                      | 29. William H. Seward.....        | 1865                |
| Lincoln.....         | 30. Elihu B. Washburne.....       | 1869                |
|                      | 31. Hamilton Fish.....            | 1869                |
| Johnson.....         | 32. William M. Evarts.....        | 1877                |
|                      | 33. James G. Blaine.....          | 1881                |
| Grant.....           | 34. F. T. Frelinghuysen.....      | 1881                |
| Hayes.....           | 35. Arthur F. Bayard.....         | 1885                |
|                      | 36. James G. Blaine.....          | 1889                |
| Garfield.....        | 37. John W. Foster.....           | 1892                |
| Arthur.....          | 38. Walter Q. Gresham.....        | 1893                |
| Cleveland.....       | 39. Richard Olney.....            | 1895                |
| B. Harrison.....     | 40. John Sherman.....             | 1897                |
|                      | 41. William R. Day.....           | 1898                |
| Cleveland.....       | 42. John Hay.....                 | 1898                |
|                      | 43. John Hay.....                 | 1901                |
| McKinley.....        | 44. Elihu Root.....               | 1905                |
|                      | 45. Robert Bacon.....             | 1909                |
| T. Roosevelt.....    | 46. Philander C. Knox.....        | 1909                |
|                      | 47. W. J. Bryan.....              | 1913                |
| Taft.....            | 48. Robert Lansing.....           | 1915                |
|                      | 49. Bainbridge Colby.....         | 1920                |
| Wilson.....          | 50. Charles E. Hughes.....        | 1921                |
|                      | 51. Charles E. Hughes.....        | 1923                |
| Harding.....         | 52. Frank B. Kellogg.....         | 1925                |
|                      | 53. Henry L. Stimson.....         | 1929                |
| Coolidge.....        | 54. Cordell Hull.....             | 1933                |
|                      | 55. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr..... | 1944                |
| Hoover.....          | 56. James F. Byrnes.....          | 1947                |
|                      | 57. George C. Marshall.....       | 1947                |
|                      | 58. Dean G. Acheson.....          | 1949                |
| F. D. Roosevelt..... |                                   |                     |

<sup>1</sup> Reappointed.

FOREIGN SERVICE EXPANSION

There has been a great expansion in our Department of State and our Foreign Service over a period of many years. Today the United States has nearly 300 missions located all over the world. Throughout the Service approximately 85 percent of the employees can be considered career personnel. In the higher brackets 60 percent of the personnel are career people. Committees dealing with our foreign affairs, both from the financial and legislative sides, continue encouraging the advancement of the career program in order to make the Service the best in the world. There are still 21 noncareer ambassadors as compared with 35 career ambassadors in the Service. Among the 14 legations, there are 2 political appointees, 9 career appointees. We have 60 career ministers employed, 34 of whom are serving as chief of missions and 26 are specially

assigned. When our Foreign Service complement is complete, the total will include 58 ambassadors, 14 legations, 52 consul generals, 127 consulates, 30 consular officers, 7 political advisory offices, and 7 special assigned offices. As world conditions change, the framework of the Service varies to fit the changing times.

OVERSEAS EMPLOYMENT

The functional purpose of the Department of State is now, and always has been, to serve the people of these United States by administering our foreign affairs.

To accomplish this purpose, as I have previously stated, the Department increased its operational units from 23 in 1913 to 113 in 1948—an expansion of 90 such units in 35 years. If this increase added to the efficiency of the Department in accomplishing its defined purpose, this increase was justified. On the contrary, if this increase did not add to the efficiency of the Department, the increase was not justified and the Department should be directed to eliminate excess functional units and combine those with like functions.

Approximately 2 years ago the Hoover Commission found that at least 46 Government agencies other than the Department of State were engaged in overseas operations and had overseas interests.

In their 1949 study, the Hoover Commission further discovered that of 193,000 Government employees overseas only 12,000 worked for the State Department. At the time of this study the Federal Works Agency had 459 workers overseas and the Federal Security Agency had 978 employees in 19 countries. There were then 743 United States civilian employees in the sparsely settled country of Libya.

The relegation of the Department of State to the background in foreign affairs had begun as far back as 1942 at the time of the gallant defense of Wake Island against the Japanese under the leadership of our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX]. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States in a June 25, 1951, statement points out that:

When Wake Island was attacked by the Japanese, no one in Washington knew who had charge of it, although Navy, Interior, Commerce and State Departments had uncertain claims on it, and final determination was that Wake was a responsibility of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Whether the status of the State Department, as it now exists, is contrived chaos or accidental confusion is most difficult to determine. The answer is hidden in papers buried deep in our archives, in private libraries made inaccessible to Members of Congress and among those papers included in the micro films taken from Mr. Chambers' pumpkin.

Under these circumstances, it is necessary for me to resort to the device of questioning a composite of all our great Secretaries of State—a composite of men like Jefferson, Adams, Monroe, Hay, Root and Charles Evans Hughes. The same questions should be asked of any Secretary of State—whether or not



a specific Secretary could qualify as to greatness.

THIS IS MY CATECHISM OF DIPLOMACY

Question: To whom is any employee of the Department of State—be he Secretary or messenger boy—responsible?

Answer: To the people of the United States of America. Such employees are subject to the Constitution and servants of the people. They cannot, according to their oath of office, serve the interests of any other nation—be that nation Russia or Britain, Rumania or Burma.

Question: What is the standing of our ambassadors and chiefs of mission abroad?

Answer: The standing of our diplomatic representatives abroad is the lowest in the history of this Republic. The State Department—as in the case of David and Saul—gives away its million. But ECA gives away its tens of millions. Our highest hope for our diplomatic representative abroad today is for him to be third high man on the Federal totem pole.

Question: What should be the guide of the Department of State when coming to Congress for appropriations?

Answer: The American battle-cry against the Barbary pirates in the first years of the nineteenth century: "Millions for defense, but not a cent for tribute."

Question: What should be the Department's policy in regard to securing other nations as our allies?

Answer: We should gain the respect of other nations. True respect may not be purchased. Any kind of respect which is for sale on the open market is not worth buying. True respect is a base product of true integrity. If true integrity is ours, a friendly nation cannot flatter us to our downfall nor may an enemy nation blackmail us into dishonor. Mercenaries are not last-ditch fighters. Allies through mutual respect are last-ditch fighters. When we get back our integrity in foreign affairs we will never lack for respect from our fellow nations.

Question: What can we do to regain the respect of other nations?

Answer: We can make it clear to all departments and agencies of the Federal Government that the accredited representatives of the State Department are in authority overseas. We can cut down in personnel of agencies other than the State Department employed abroad. We can turn down unnecessary foreign loans. We can refuse to give outright grants to solvent nations. We can summon up force, rather than pay ransom, to countries who unlawfully kidnap and otherwise abuse our citizens. We can keep our promises, made legitimately and in good faith, and we can insist on other nations meeting their obligations to us.

Question: What methods shall we use to insure the success of any campaign to regain the respect of nations?

Answer: This Nation once had the respect of nations. We had it because of the caliber of people who then worked for our State Department. We can have it again by insisting that the right kind of people be employed by our true representatives abroad.

Question: Would you place any one qualification above all other for service in the State Department?

Answer: Yes. I would demand that the first qualification be that the State Department officer know his own country—the United States of America. No man can represent this country fully unless he knows the full producing strength, the artistic, cultural, and educational contributions of each of the 48 States and of Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. Indians are no longer on the war-path 50 miles west of Hoboken. Nebraska is an arsenal of food crops—not, as it was once represented in one of the Department's articles for distribution in the Soviet Union—as a small part of the "Great American Desert." The ignorant should be sent to school; not sent abroad to misrepresent this vast Republic.

Question: What would you consider the second qualification of an able employee of the State Department?

Answer: Knowledge of an understanding about the country to which he is sent as the United States representative. He must be aware of the delicate shades of differences in the politics, social composition, and economics of the country in which he is assigned to serve us. He must know its history, its geography, its culture. A successful United States diplomat in Bolivia could well be a failure in Denmark. A successful diplomat in Denmark could well be a failure in India. The responsibility of issuing such assignments is great; but it is not impossible to meet that responsibility with tact and judgment.

Question: Is there a final requirement for service in the Department at home or in the Foreign Service abroad?

Answer: The final requirement is that of absolute loyalty to the United States. No person of even the hint of a divided loyalty should be permitted to serve in the Department in any capacity. Each employee from the Secretary down should be checked, double-checked, and triple-checked by the FBI and other agencies in authority. This Nation can ill afford treason, or even deflection, in these critical times.

Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State  
Sail on, O Union, strong and great  
Humanity with all its fears  
With all the hopes of future years  
Is hanging breathless on thy fate.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. First, I wish to ask the gentleman this question: When the chairman of the subcommittee was on the floor, I asked him to yield, and he declined to yield. Would the gentleman from Nebraska, who, in my opinion, has delivered one of the most masterful presentations on the operation of the Department of State that has gone into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the past 15 years, tell us about what length of time in weeks or months his distinguished committee has spent on the bill which we are now considering? Could the gentleman give us an approximate idea or statement of the length of time spent by his committee on this bill?

Mr. STEFAN. We went to work shortly after January 3. We had the

bill ready to mark up for 2 months. I am sorry for the delay. I do not know the reason for it. Some of the Members have perhaps forgotten many of the things which were brought out in the hearings. I do not know the cause of the delay. We of the minority have had no responsibility for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not critical of that. But I would like to develop this point: A great many of us are criticized throughout the country in the columns and by radio commentators and in editorials because we do not spend much of our time in our districts. This morning I took the time to look through the Congressional Directory to find out the number of days the various sessions of the Congress have been in session, beginning with 1920 and coming down to date. It would be very interesting to you if you want to check on that to see how many days we have been in session.

But this is the question I want to ask the gentleman: As a member of your distinguished committee, who has rendered the kind of service which is reflected here in these hearings, and in the debate, will the gentleman state whether that could be done unless the members were on the job here in the Congress?

Mr. STEFAN. No. It was necessary for all members to stay here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They have to be here?

Mr. STEFAN. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And they could not be back in their districts, visiting, but they have to be here in the Congress or attending committee hearings? Does the gentleman agree on that?

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it the gentleman's opinion that since 1939 or 1940 or 1942, whichever date you want to take, that the State Department of our Government has had a far wider scope in which to operate than ever before in the history of this country?

Mr. STEFAN. They have had a wider scope. Under several reorganizations, the Department has grown rapidly. The time has arrived for us to really give the State Department the position it actually deserves in world affairs in order to gain the respect of foreign governments. The demands on the Department are tremendous.

As I said a while ago, we have three or four or five Voices of America. It is not a matter of appropriations. It will never be effective until you coordinate this important operation. You have to have one Voice. ECA has more people in information in France than has the International Information, Voice of America of the Department of State, which is doing information work. GARIOA has information. There is a Free Voice of America. The occupied areas have an information service. NATO is going to have an information organization. There should be one coordinated Voice of America. It is badly needed. Further than that, on your general missions, in the regular diplomatic field, how can you have your chief of missions deal politically successfully with the representatives of a foreign government when another American of-



ficial, armed with diplomatic status, plus funds to give away, bypasses your regular chief of missions?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My next question is this: The gentleman has outlined very clearly, for me at least, the contrary influence that these various operations have against the policy the State Department might have. Would the gentleman go so far as to say that the State Department did have considerable influence, and by having Congress implement by authorizing and appropriating these other agencies, they are now somewhat cutting across the face of the State Department policy? In other words, did not the State Department back the Truman plan? Did not the State Department back the Marshall plan, and did not the State Department back the ECA operations?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In every instance. Now, to me, as I have watched these operations, that said in advance that these propositions would eventually lead us to great peril, if I may use that word, because I think it is a terrorizing peril to contemplate.

Mr. STEFAN. That is the peril I am talking about. If you do not put the Department of State and Foreign Service back to its original top position, you are going to continue gaining the disrespect of foreign governments, and making the Department of State and the Foreign Service impotent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. We have got to strengthen your Department of State.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. COX. I have asked the gentleman to yield that I might give applause to this very patriotic, this eloquent, dramatic, and informative statement which he has made.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. I regret that all Members of the House were not here to hear it. They would be inspired by the remarks which the gentleman has made.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I, too, would like to compliment the gentleman upon his statement. I would like to ask him a double-barrel question, if I may. Can the gentleman tell me the pay and allowances of Ambassadors and their classifications, and who determines their classifications?

Mr. STEFAN. The determination is made by the Secretary of State. We have four classes of Ambassadors: first, second, third, and fourth. As I recall it, the class 1 Ambassador receives a stipend of \$25,000 a year, with allowances. I think it goes to \$20,000 for class 2; \$17,500 for class 3, and \$15,000 for class 4. We once had many more Ministers than

Ambassadors, but in Central and South America where, under protocol, most of the foreign countries had Ambassadors there, we made it possible for our Ministers to become Ambassadors, with the understanding that they would receive the salaries of ministers, which is \$15,000.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us who determines those classifications?

Mr. STEFAN. The Secretary of State. Of course, in consultation with other officials.

Mr. GROSS. How do the allowances run?

Mr. STEFAN. They vary. The largest allowance I think in amount would be the Ambassador to the Court of St. James's, \$25,000 salary, plus about \$28,178 allowances.

Mr. GROSS. How much?

Mr. STEFAN. \$28,178 for allowances.

In Paris I think the salary is \$25,000, with an additional \$24,400 for allowances. It is on a sliding scale based on the importance of the mission.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, we are being very liberal with them, are we not?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; I think we are.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman from Nebraska has made one of the finest statements we have heard on the floor in a long time, and he has pointed out very cogently one of the most serious difficulties that our Department of State has had in our foreign representation, namely, that the heads of mission are in effect subordinate to other phases of the Government operating in the foreign field. I take it the gentleman believes that these people who are representing other agencies of the Government should do their business through the Ambassadors, rather than separately. What does the gentleman think?

Mr. STEFAN. They should do it through the chief of our mission. We should have only one chief American representative in a foreign country; otherwise his foreign counterpart will bypass the accredited American chief of mission.

Mr. HINSHAW. And the chief of mission is the Ambassador?

Mr. STEFAN. The Ambassador or Minister; yes.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. WERDEL. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks very much and join with the others in thanking him for the attention he has given to the subject. I wonder if the gentleman can give us some detail about the efforts of the State Department in cleaning up and releasing people who are bad security risks and for homosexuality.

Mr. STEFAN. I think they are doing a good job. I was told recently that 20 had been separated from the service because of social reasons, and others were under investigation. Some additional ones are being released. Mr. Humelsine, the Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, assisted by Mr. Sam Boykin, his assistant, are doing an ex-

cellent job. They are using the McCarran rider along with all the authority they presently have, to do it. I know they want to get rid of all bad security risks, and they are doing a good job; but I do not know how much authority they have in certain cases.

Mr. WERDEL. Additional bad security risks have been found since the last report was filed; is that right?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. We are indebted to our colleague for a splendid talk on the State Department. I should like to ask a question prompted by something Dean Rusk said in the hearings, page 158. He indicated that we were working toward a situation in Korea that would permit us to pull our forces out; just what did he mean by that?

Mr. STEFAN. I questioned Mr. Rusk during the hearings at some length on that, getting him to admit that we were in fact in war in Korea. I think the fact is that at that time it was a question of whether or not we were going to be chased out. But the long policy is, of course, to get out of Korea if we can get the North Koreans and South Koreans together so that all foreign forces can eventually get out, so there will be a peaceful Korean Republic. I think that is what Mr. Rusk had in mind. I did not get the idea that he meant to get out while fighting was going on. At that time, he said "We were going to stay there if we can."

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Then his statement was not exactly in line with recent happenings.

Mr. STEFAN. No; those hearings were held some time ago.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Are there any war potentials going to Russia and her satellites through ECA and other means?

Mr. STEFAN. Through ECA?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Or otherwise.

Mr. STEFAN. We get more information on that through Mr. Sawyer, Secretary of Commerce, when he comes before us, because the export control is located in the Department of Commerce. Mr. Sawyer indicated that there was considerable going there. He said they had considerable trouble in checking the reshipments after the arms and munitions got over to these countries, Britain and other countries who were getting Marshall-plan aid. They were charged with using some of our money for building factories which made potential war materials, and there were some transshipments; but now I understand the Export Controls Division has representatives over there and they are getting considerable cooperation from the people who are the beneficiaries of our charity.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does the gentleman know offhand how many the Voice of America employ?



Mr. STEFAN. I gave it to the gentleman. They are asking for over 14,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. They spend a quarter of a million dollars a day.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, they had \$121,000,000 for the fiscal year 1951. They are asking for \$115,000,000 for 1952. The committee cut that down to \$85,000,000, but they are over in the Senate asking for another \$90,000,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The \$85,000,000 is approximately a quarter of a million dollars a day?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Well, is there any reason why it should go higher than that with only that many employees?

Mr. STEFAN. The committee did not think so because the committee not only cut them from \$115,000,000 down to \$85,000,000, but cut them \$10,000,000 in another item. We cut that agency \$40,000,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished and able gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to make this observation in connection with the very subject the gentleman is now discussing and which I omitted to make when I had the floor earlier during this debate. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] contended that in this reduction of the Voice of America appropriation from \$115,000,000 to \$85,000,000 that activity would wind up with over \$100,000,000 for 1952. He claimed there was a carry-over of some \$15,000,000. There was a carry-over of \$15,000,000, but not one cent of that money is for operating expenses. That is and was for capital outlay previously voted in connection with the acquisition of electronic equipment.

Mr. STEFAN. Also for some construction.

Mr. ROONEY. The point is that none of it is for operation or personnel of the Voice of America. So that when we made this cut from \$115,000,000 to \$85,000,000, it was a straight out-and-out substantial \$30,000,000 cut.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his very good research work and his excellent statement. There is one other question to which I would like to address myself. For a number of years, as a matter of fact for most of our history, we have made the unfortunate mistake of appointing men to these ambassadorial posts because of wealth rather than because of knowledge, is that not so?

Mr. STEFAN. That is something over which the gentleman and I have no control and over which the committee has no control. Our committee has always favored career service and also endeavored to the best of our ability to help those in the lower brackets who are in the noncareer service to improve their status. The gentleman is absolutely right. Because a man has a tremendous amount of money, he has contributed a

lot of money to the Democratic or Republican campaign fund, he is rewarded with a post. Therefore we have to depend upon our career service men to hold up his arms when he does represent us in some foreign countries.

The gentleman might be glad to know that over 65 percent of those in the service are career people. We are rapidly approaching the point when eventually the two great political parties will see that it is best to have a career man, an experienced man, to represent us in a foreign country rather than to reward someone because he is rich or influential.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I am well aware that is true and I want to put that in the RECORD. Somebody said, I believe, that these are well paying positions. In regard to the cost of keeping these embassies open, many of the men are spending more money than they are receiving.

Mr. STEFAN. Let me tell the gentleman that the Foreign Service is the best paid service in the United States. The individual is better taken care of than any other Foreign Service in the world. It is the best service in the United States.

Mr. BURNSIDE. But the cost is high for the people in these major diplomatic posts.

Mr. STEFAN. We take care of that. We take care of his rent, his living allowances, the differential in living, and if he goes to a cold climate, we even give him clothes and hospitalization. We give him service that no other employee of the Federal Government in the United States gets, and they are pretty well satisfied. We try to improve the service and try to make it attractive.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I am not speaking of the general run; I am speaking about the ambassadorial positions in the larger countries.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, \$25,000 plus about \$28,000 for allowances is not so bad, is it?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Is it not a fact, though, that they have to entertain many officials in this Foreign Service?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes, they have to, and sometimes they overentertain. We called attention to the fact that many times they entertain themselves more than they should.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Along the line that we have been discussing of the pay that ambassadors get, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] raised the question that the Secretary-General of the United Nations receives a salary of \$40,000 a year. Would the gentleman care to comment or give his views on whether \$40,000 is too much for the Secretary-General of the United Nations?

Mr. STEFAN. Well, we do not pay all of that. That is a cooperative venture. We pay a certain percentage.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman tell us how much we do pay of that amount?

Mr. STEFAN. We pay about 38 percent. Mr. Warren Austin, chief delegate of the United States to the United

Nations, has done an excellent job of cutting that percentage down.

Mr. BOW. Did we not at one time pay about 70 percent?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes, in some cases. We are getting that down, too.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman say how many members of the United Nations are now in arrears in their payments to the United Nations?

Mr. STEFAN. I think we have some of that information in the hearings, if the gentleman will forgive me for not taking the time to go into that question now to answer him. He will find that in the hearings.

Mr. BOW. Would the gentleman care to comment on whether \$40,000 is adequate to the Secretary General?

Mr. STEFAN. I could not comment on that.

Mr. Chairman, if the committee will forgive me, I have consumed an hour of time and there are others that want to speak. I will be glad to answer further questions when we read the bill under the 5-minute rule, because I have other statements to make at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, there is little point in my reiterating what the previous speakers have had to say about this bill. It carries approximately \$1,051,715,000 which, I might mention in passing, is ten times what it was 10 years ago and about twice what it was 5 years ago. A substantial portion of the increase is occasioned by the very controversial Department of State total appropriations for which as recently as 1942 were only some \$38,000,000. While this over-all cut for the State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary Departments is probably the highest of all the various bills, it is not enough, nor in the right places.

In considering the appropriations of the various branches of the Government from year to year, the committee seeks to apply a yardstick to the activities concerned, in an effort to determine what the accomplishments have been and to relate those accomplishments to the dollars requested with the ultimate aim of providing the maximum benefit for the least number of dollars, consistent with the current condition of the public purse.

In attempting to apply this technique, however, to the Department of State, we seek in vain for the yardstick to apply. Just how would you determine, in your own conscience, the benefits that have accrued to this country in the last 10 years as a result of the operations of our Department of State?

The State Department is expected to protect the interest of the United States in world affairs and to promote those policies that will lead to and insure the peace. Thus in seeking the yardstick to apply, we must examine our relative position in world affairs at this time. If this then is our criterion, we must conclude that the Department of State has been an abysmal failure.

None will disagree with the fact that our basic policy at this time should be



the containment of communism as a means of securing the peace, yet we find that in the past few years the Russian menace has grown from a relatively insignificant factor to a colossus that now dominates over one-fifth of the area of the world and rules the lives of some 800,000,000 people. One by one the countries have fallen—Rumania, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the most tragic of all, our old friend in the East, China.

I do not impugn the motives of men and for the sake of argument, I am willing to concede that the sell-out of China was due to incompetence and not necessarily to disloyalty. The motives and the reasons are all behind us and all that remains is the hard, cold fact that our diplomacy has failed, and is failing, and will fail under a system that plays politics with blood and flesh.

In former Congresses, I was proud to be reminded from time to time of the advice of George Washington, when, on the occasion of his farewell address, he warned posterity of the dangers inherent in any foreign alliances. To speak of this now and to quote the great Washington is interpreted as the rankest heresy by the one-worlders and internationalists who would spill our blood and spend our sustenance in the quarrels of the world whose problems we seek to solve. Yes, you rarely find a man in the well of the House today with the courage to quote the great Washington on foreign policy. To do so makes one vulnerable to the smear press who hangs heinous phrases around your neck. Isolationist and obstructionist is the kindest name-calling one can expect under these circumstances. I often wonder what George Washington would say about all of this.

With the exception of our venture in the Spanish-American War, we got along pretty well by minding our own business until the Democratic administration adopted the doctrine that we hear so much today, known as collective security, which precipitated us into World War I and sowed the seeds of continued interference into the lives of people living in the remotest sections of the world.

Then we started to playing footsie with the League of Nations and gradually became so committed internationally that we wound up with World War II and destroyed the evil dictators of the world, and in the process, underwrote the greatest dictator of them all, thereby putting us into a crisis infinitely worse than we faced before the Second World War.

On January 6, 1941, President Roosevelt proclaimed the "four freedoms," laying down the noble objective of our tragic adventure as freedom of speech and worship and from want and fear, yet abrogated them all in an appeasement of Russia in international conferences that will cry out in history as the crime of the ages. This led to world war III and, while the administration insists it is a police action, I call anything where casualties are numbered in

the hundreds of thousands nothing less than war.

This, then, is the inevitable result of collective security. The phrase makers may call me an isolationist, an obstructionist, an American firster, or some other alleged smear; but if such a phrase labels me as one who is sick at heart at the betrayal of our own people, and one who does not believe in the doctrine that perpetual peace may only be maintained by everlasting war, I accept the title.

Collective security means we pick up the check. Since we cannot place a value on the death and maiming and the suffering of our people, the only statistic left is the dollar value of our adventure in world diplomacy, and I leave it to you to determine what this mass destruction has done to the finest country God ever put on the earth—stripping us of timber, copper, lead, zinc, oil, iron, and other natural resources, exhausting our soil through overcropping and lack of fertilizers.

We spent billions in prosecuting World War I and in reconstructing the countries of not only our allies, but our enemies as well. What do we have to show for it over 30 years after the armistice? A lot of bills long overdue.

We still carry on our books the debts of World War I. What a lot of silly bookkeeping. Over \$16,000,000,000 still due and unpayable, including \$5,000,000,000 from France and \$7,000,000,000 from Great Britain.

So, in furtherance of our collective security we proceeded to give away and loan during and after World War II over \$79,000,000,000 more. Lend-lease, what an empty phrase. It cost us over \$48,000,000,000. This was a loan to our friends, but who is there among you so naive as to think that it will be repaid? We cannot even collect interest on World I indebtedness, let alone anything from World War II. We gave them the Marshall plan, civilian supplies, UNRRA, mutual defense assistance, special British loans, Export-Import Bank loans, and all of the other schemes that were to save the world. Still we find the world is far from being saved. Yes, I know many will say we would have been worse off if we had not bankrupted ourselves in these wild fanciful dreams. To that I say—how could we have been? The Communist orbit now embraces 35 percent of the world's population and one-fifth of the world area. How stupid can we get? Conceding that some of these expenditures, such as relief feeding, and so forth, might have some justification, how far can we go in dollar diplomacy? Think what these sums would have done to keep our defenses strong and invulnerable. Think what these sums would mean to our arsenal, our stock-pile, and the very dynamics that keep a free enterprise strong through a low tax rate and a sound dollar that would permit our people to work and plan in the complete security that is their birthright.

What has happened to these vast sums that have been poured around the world? How much of it has been expropriated

by the very enemy we seek to contain? Since less than two billion of the seventy-nine billion has been paid back, what has happened to the rest? Has it secured the world? How many guns has it produced and what assurance do we have that they will be used with us and not against us? How many of an army has General Eisenhower produced and is the will to fight a strong force with our allies?

We cannot bleed, and I mean literally, for the entire world. There are over 2,000,000,000 people in this wide world and we just cannot take them all to dinner. Collective security commits us to bankruptcy, and let us not be lulled by the fact that we ended this fiscal year with a temporary surplus. We are committed to bills as yet unpaid that may well create the blackest financial crisis in history. Our people cry for sanity in foreign affairs and just a little regard for our own welfare. In answer to their cry, they are offered dollar diplomacy and an administration that acts on whim, fancy, and in a fit of temper deprives the Nation of the services of the greatest military leader of the twentieth century.

Now they say collective security will bring us peace in Korea. Another Soviet trap that will engineer a peace at the thirty-eighth parallel and create another encircled, occupied Berlin that will nail down still another large segment of our military might, while Stalin strokes his chin to decide where the next incident will be. Will it be Germany? Yugoslavia? Iran?

I do not want to build a great wall around these precious shores, but I do want a bulwark of defense that will deter any greedy eye which may glance this way. I assuredly do not want a bunch of wild-eyed dreamers constantly thinking up new and novel ways of extracting from us the things they envy and covet. It is enough that we have subsidized the socialization of the world. Let us pull in a little and save what we have left.

How international minded would the countries of the world be if we were out of cash? Is this collective security a two-way street? Of course not. England and all of the countries abroad are truly isolationist and lend lip service to collective security only as long as they collect from us.

We have a lot to do at home. Instead of squandering these huge funds in giveaway programs abroad, let us try to balance the budget. Let us return to a sound dollar and get some of this money back in the hands of our own people and our States so that we can provide for the old and indigent. Let us build our defenses through building and maintaining a strong economy. Instead of throwing feathers at communism abroad, let us throw bricks at it at home. I am reminded that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover recently estimated there were 54,000 Communists in this country; and remember that this represents the hard core only and does not include the dupes and intellectual dopes who subscribe to



communism and call themselves good Americans. Fifty-four thousand Communists is one for every 2,700 citizens or one for every 900 taxpayers. It is something to think about. If my recollection serves me correctly, the Russian revolution was successful with one Communist member for every 2,200 citizens. It all depends on where they are and I wonder if we know where all of these 54,000 are today. How many of them are in government—Federal, State, or local. How many in defense industry. I do not know. I wish I did.

The legislative committees of the House should give more thought to the authorizations they make. Our subcommittee can only make superficial savings. Since the Korean War, we have passed three more great tax bills. The last one was the largest ever, yet this bill falls short by \$1,600,000,000 of covering the one proposal for foreign aid. Ohio's share is \$487,000,000, or more than our State government spends for our 8,000,000 people. Two thousand dollars per family of four for the national tax bill alone is breaking the taxpayers' backs. Many of these taxes are cleverly concealed in packages of food and clothing and often amount to more than the cost of the goods, then Congress is charged with failing to stop inflation and the deception becomes complete.

In conclusion, and above all, let us discard this doctrine of collective security and go back to the advice of George Washington. To the taxpayer, collective security is mostly "collective," and least secure.

I want to reminisce for about a half a minute to the time when I was about 18 years old, and just getting to feel like a citizen of the United States. I remember an American citizen by the name of Perdicardis was captured by some bandit who held him for ransom in the Near East. I remember how this country perked up and what an uplift it gave us all when Theodore Roosevelt sent one simple little message to bring out Perdicardis alive or Rasuli dead. He came out alive the next day.

As we think about it, when a member of the American Press Association is being held captive, I pray that the spirit of Theodore Roosevelt might return to the State Department of the United States and we will once more take the position that America should be jealous of her rights and ready to maintain them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, this House has an obligation to the taxpayers to search out every case of wasteful spending by the Government and to end that kind of spending. I direct the Members' attention to an item of \$1,312,100 for program evaluation service in the budget presented to the Appropriations Committee by the Voice of America. I wish to proceed on the premise that I am a strong advocate of advertising but from my business experience I cannot condone such an extravagant program. Businesses throughout this country would go broke

if they spent one-tenth as much evaluating the effect of their promotion and advertising as they do in direct expenditures. Imagine the American Tobacco Co. adopting such a policy. The Voice people try to justify this expenditure of \$1,312,100 by saying it was the only way they could find out whether the Voice programs were accomplishing anything. The Voice was requesting \$10,226,433 for operation of its radio programs which means that for every \$10 spent for operating the radio programs the Voice wanted to spend a dollar for evaluating the programs.

We need only to look at world conditions today to realize the ineffectiveness of the Voice programs. To think that we are spending the taxpayers' money to evaluate the ineffectiveness is just plain silly. Members of the House will obtain some idea of the money involved in the individual contracts from the fact that one contract with International Public Opinion Research is in the amount of \$84,995.

I salute all advertising men for their accomplishments in this world of ours. The advertising man is worthy of far greater recognition than he receives. He has been content thus far to stand in the background and let the so-called captains of industry take all the bows for America's great productive power. But what makes such production possible? It is the advertising man who, with his persuasive words, causes people to want more and more of the things that are produced in such tremendous quantities. Without the demand and consumption thus induced, production would not be possible on its present scale.

Advertising men have given of their talents to create and sustain a public opinion favorable to worthy civic endeavors, all of which has been done without expense to the projects involved. It is a manifestation of public spirit worthy of high commendation. These advertising geniuses would gladly give of their time and knowledge to establish a program that would convince others that our way of life is best.

Within the American way we have the best product in the world. Our difficulty has been that we hired the wrong sales manager to sell our product.

I suggest this House establish a committee to consider an effective Voice program. I, for one, would be anxious to serve on such a committee. Just because the present operation has been a failure does not mean that it could not be very effective and very economical. It must be operated independent of the State Department with the State Department doing nothing more than acting as a censor.

Up to the present time there has been no justification for the vast sums that have been spent. If the creativeness and ingenuity of the advertising and promotion men of America is used it would not be necessary to spend thousands of dollars to evaluate their work. The results would be known immediately. They are trained and possess the necessary know-how to sell their product.

It is not necessary to spend a dollar in evaluating the Voice of America. Just stop all appropriations as soon as possible and let a committee made up of Members of this House establish an overall American sales program.

We have had an Un-American Activities Committee for quite some time. I suggest we have a pro-America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I merely want to make sure that the gentleman is acquainted with the amount of money requested of the committee for research and evaluation. What does the gentleman understand to be the amount of money in the budget request for research and evaluation?

Mr. AYRES. I am basing this on what I understand to be their request, \$1,000,000, or they are trying to justify the expenditure of \$1,312,100 to evaluate what they have done.

Mr. ROONEY. Where did the gentleman get that information?

Mr. AYRES. It has been by direct contact with one of the members who was making the request.

Mr. ROONEY. One of the members?

Mr. AYRES. I am not free to divulge the individual.

Mr. ROONEY. I am rather surprised that the Republican National Committee was so grossly misinformed, because there was a request of \$3,531,600 for research and evaluation. If the gentleman wants to fire a shot why not take a good shot?

Mr. AYRES. Is the gentleman inferring that this figure was given to me by the Republican National Committee?

Mr. ROONEY. I practically made the direct statement to that effect.

Mr. AYRES. Well, if that is the gentleman's claim I would like to inform him that he is wrong. You quoted the figures yourself on page 844 of the hearings.

Mr. ROONEY. I cannot understand where else you could get a speech written around the figure \$1,312,100 when the fact of the matter is it should be \$3,531,600. The amount \$2,219,500 requested for research and evaluation studies, overseas missions activities, was omitted. You'll find that at page 1036.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. AYRES. Would the gentleman answer a question for me?

Mr. ROONEY. I will try to.

Mr. AYRES. Does the gentleman condone the spending of one-tenth of every dollar to evaluate the effectiveness of that dollar spent?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not condone any such thing, I must say to the gentleman. He is finding fault as I have for some time. It was this committee that cut the resent supplemental request of the Voice of America by 90 percent. But is it improper to expect that proper and



dependable evaluation and research at a reasonable cost be made into the effectiveness of the program? Does not the gentleman think that that is one way we can find out whether or not the Voice of America is effective and doing a good job?

Mr. AYRES. I felt for some time, I may say to the gentleman from New York, prior to coming to Congress that we could put forth a very effective program if we had the right men running it and the right type of program.

Mr. ROONEY. Since the gentleman has been here and for some time previous to that I have been highly critical of the operations of the Voice of America. But my criticisms have been constructive criticisms. Does the gentleman from Ohio want to cure the patient by cutting his head off?

Mr. AYRES. You cannot make it operate if we are to follow the same line it has been operating on in the past.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will follow the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] on his side of the aisle, one of the ablest Members of this House, who for 12 years has served on this very subcommittee dealing with the Department of State, the gentleman would be better informed than whomever it was, and he does not care to divulge the name, who gave him the figures he referred to a while ago.

Mr. AYRES. I feel confident this figure is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the gentleman that the figure is incorrect.

Mr. AYRES. I again refer you to page 844 of the hearings.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is just a little conservative in his statement.

Mr. AYRES. If I have been too conservative I will correct that, too, but I have quoted the figures Mr. ROONEY gave.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. I infer that the gentleman has great faith in the value of advertising?

Mr. AYRES. I do.

Mr. ADAIR. Is it the gentleman's opinion that if we were to try to advertise our system of government on a basis comparable to the manner in which we advertise our commercial products in this country we could be successful in that?

Mr. AYRES. I feel confident that we could. We have to come down to the level of the people we are dealing with. They are not particularly interested in our form of government when we just say our form is best. However, we have to prove to them that we are interested in them. For instance, I have felt for a long time that if we could get to the children of these foreign countries it would be very effective. All of you who run for Congress know you are guilty of flattery when you say to a child, "You

are about the prettiest child I have ever seen." Please the child and you please the parents. The same thing applies wherever human nature takes its course. There are literally thousands of ways to get at the root of the thing and start pleasing the children of these people to make them believe that we are really good Americans, and our way of life is best.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF ADEQUATE DOMESTIC PRODUCTION OF STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 4607 on June 26, 1951. My bill is identical with H. R. 4571, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN]. These bills had for their purpose the drawing together under one head all agencies dealing with the mining industry and the Government stockpile program.

Last September this Congress, in approving the Defense Production Act of 1950, provided the executive branch of the Government with the authority and means to encourage the exploration and development of mines to produce the metals and minerals needed to sustain our industrial might.

As of today, however, there seems to be little realization in the administrative branch of the Government of the importance of vitalizing and expanding our domestic mining industry. All that has been done to date is to divide, among a maze of some 40 agencies and committees, piecemeal authority over operation of the minerals program recommended by Congress.

I am not a mining man. I represent a great farming area which has not a single mine within its confines. My constituents have only a cursory interest in mining—and that to the extent that it provides the metals to produce the farm implements and the fuel to heat homes and aid them in conduct of their day-to-day farming operations, and for adequate national defense. I have taken a great personal interest in the development of a strong domestic mining industry since I had the opportunity, as a member of the Military Affairs Committee, to work on the drafting and the enactment into law of the Stockpiling Act, both in 1939 and in 1946.

The members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee have accorded

me the honor of permitting me to sit with them during the course of their searching investigations of the conduct of the minerals program in the present defense effort. This has been a revealing experience. You have heard them discuss their findings on this floor many times.

To me, the confused situation which exists in the minerals program is little short of catastrophic. The truth of the matter is we face a disaster approaching that suffered at Pearl Harbor and no one is doing anything about it. As at Pearl Harbor, we have a divided authority in our defense set-up with the result that nothing is being accomplished but a continual passing of the buck from one agency to another. This administrative inertia is further complicated by the fact that the many agencies involved in dealing with our metal and mineral production seek to outdo each other in bottlenecks the programs that have been initiated while they zealously guard their own administrative authority.

Frankly, gentlemen, that master of confusion, Joseph Stalin, could not have done a better job of preventing the speedy acceleration of mining in the United States.

Let us look at the record. In the period since last September only seven domestic contracts have been entered into by the Government for purchase of metals. Some progress had been made in making loans for exploration. As of June 30, the Government had provided just short of \$3,000,000 for this purpose although the Defense Production Administration had set aside \$10,000,000 for the past fiscal year. That is the net accomplishment for more than 9 months of operating under the Defense Production Act. It is a sorry record.

As a result what have we added to the productive capacity of our mines? Have we increased the supply of manganese, of chromium, of tungsten, of cobalt, of copper, lead and zinc, and of the host of other metals so necessary to the production of jet aircraft, of tanks, submarines, and the countless other implements of defense? Gentlemen, that question may be answered in one word—"No." And the worst is yet to come. We have been living off of the fat of our minerals and metals supply. We shall shortly be living hand-to-mouth. The impact of the defense production program has not yet reached its peak, but when it does our defense program administrators are going to wake up and find that it will bog down because of the lack of the basic raw materials needed to keep industrial production going. Just how far are you going to get in the production of jet engines without an adequate supply of tungsten, chromium, nickel, cobalt, and columbium?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. It is a fact that very, very recently the miners in my district at Mackay, Idaho, very close to one of the most promising tungsten properties in the State of Idaho, were told by one of the representatives of the bureaucracy in Washington that they



might just as well go down to Nevada and play the slot machines as continue any longer attempting to produce tungsten in Idaho.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution, because it is in line with my own observations here. I appreciate the gentleman's comment.

I may add there that blueprints do not shoot, and you are not going to win any future combat in the air unless you have those jets off the drawing board. They are not going to get off the drawing boards unless we get these particular metals on hand and coming along in sufficient quantity.

Then we shall see a mad scramble to reshuffle authority over mineral production, a rush of new programs intended to bring out metals and minerals, and no doubt, a myriad of explanations as to why this action had not taken place before. And further, when this starvation diet of metals occurs, it will be accompanied by lay-offs at industrial plants, the migration of labor to other jobs, a loss of payrolls, and howls by labor for action—action which should have been taken months ago.

Another illustration I could add here at this point of my own is this. We wrote the Stockpile Act into law and it was signed by the President on July 23, 1946. We set up a 5-year program intending to acquire enough of these strategic and critical materials so that when war should strike we would not be caught entirely short.

After 4 years of that, on July 23, 1950, the stockpile had acquired only about 34 percent of that yardstick or goal, and after the war started in Korea we found the officials in charge of that program suddenly upped the yardstick to nearly double of what it had been prior to that. That is exactly contrary to what we had in mind when we wrote the stockpile law in 1946. We intended to have enough acquired by the time that war came so that we would not have to do that very thing. But at that time they had only about 34 percent of the stockpile program on the smaller budget or yardstick that they had set prior to the Korean War.

I could cite numerous examples of the bottlenecks in the minerals and metals program, but I shall not bore you with their details. Many of you are more familiar with specific cases than I am. However, I would like to point out some of the stumbling blocks that hamper the minerals program and make mining men throw up their hands in disgust. I have literally run around in circles from one agency to another vainly trying to get accurate information and effective action.

I might add at this point the observation that in my opinion those of us who wrote the Stockpile Act recognize in paragraph 1 of that act, which is Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, that the health of the domestic mining industry was of greater importance than the stockpile. They are both important, but the health of the domestic mining industry is of greater importance to our self-sufficiency, national defensewise, than the stockpile itself.

In the first place, there are no clear-cut requirements for metals and minerals. The Munitions Board has not figured out the military requirements for these raw materials. Goals set by the Munitions Board were retained at less than \$4,000,000,000 total throughout the first 4 years of their administration of Public Law 520 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Stockpile Act. Then after the Korean War broke the goal was raised to \$8,870,000,000 by December 31, 1950. The uncertainty and confusion is rampant. That is a serious indictment of failure of the Munitions Board to grasp their responsibility and their duty under that act. Therefore, the other agencies are somewhat at a loss as to their goals. Despite this fact, however, they have not made any real concrete progress because of inertia, policy tiffs, and out-and-out jealousy over their various prerogatives. The Defense Minerals Administration, staffed by mining industry men anxious to get a program going, has been hobbled in its efforts by a group in the Secretary of the Interior's office who have become masters of the tactics of delaying important policy decisions and minerals development programs—although none of them have had any experience in mining. At the present time this group is still sitting on programs submitted by DMA months ago. Programs that are not bottlenecked at this point become pigeonholed in the General Services Administration, where at the present time many long-term purchase contracts lie dormant, while the Nation cries for the materials these contracts would bring out. Another agency, equally guilty in preventing mineral development, is the Office of Price Stabilization. Failure to face up to realities and set ceiling prices for metals and minerals in line with the world markets has caused much-needed metals to flow to other nations, and has kept mines closed in our own country that only need an adequate and firm price to unlock their hidden wealth.

Is it therefore little wonder that a mining official recently said, "Anything that's been accomplished by the metals industry in the past year has been in spite of the Government and not because of it"?

It is high time that Congress forcibly express its views on what needs to be done to bring order out of this chaos in the minerals program, to remove the uncertainty that exists, and stimulate our domestic mining industry.

In my own mind the simple solution that can be readily arrived at under existing law is for all mineral policies and program to be developed by one agency, directed by that agency, and brought to conclusion by that agency. It is my suggestion that a top mining man be made responsible for development of mineral policy and programs. To aid him in this work the policy and program functions as they apply to metals and minerals, now lodged in the Interior Department should be divorced from that Department and placed under this one responsible man who should be given full authority to direct the various other major agencies participating in any

minerals program to carry out DPA policies and get the domestic mining industry into full production. This top minerals staff, which must be manned by experienced mining personnel, could be placed directly in the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Gentlemen, we are at the crossroads in our mineral preparedness. Even now it may be too late to salvage our production program, but there is an outside chance that we can get our mineral program on the right track. Let us hope, that for our national security, that those in charge of our defense will quickly see the light and take the needed steps now to insure a strong domestic mining industry.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa in again bringing to the attention of the Congress the situation that we face in connection with strategic and critical materials and their production and beneficiation in this country. We have held numerous hearings, not only in Washington but throughout the country, on the matter, and the situation you have described is universal, not only in Washington but in other places. We have tried in various ways to get this program started, and up to date it has not rolled. I think the gentleman is performing a real service in again calling the attention of Congress to the difficulties we are having in developing our domestic production of these critical and strategic materials for the war effort. We must get this program started and every one of us should help in the splendid effort the gentleman is making.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for his splendid observation. I have had occasion to visit the Committee on Mines, on which the gentleman serves. I have had occasion to observe his work on the floor of this House, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] has made a real contribution to this effort and has rendered invaluable service to our Nation. I know the gentleman from Montana realizes, as I do, that this is point one, where we start our own rating in the family of nations, and without the mining industry we would be absolutely rated as a have not nation, and would be rated at the bottom of the ladder. It is only as we get ourselves squared away with a vigorous, healthy mining industry that we can maintain our position in the family of nations.

I want to commend the gentleman very highly for his own work in this field.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

#### INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION MEETING

(Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and make an announcement.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by Vice President BARKLEY, who is also president of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union, to notify the House that there







than \$84,600 on funds available for personal services.

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 50, 51, and 52—General expenses: Appropriate \$8,784,935, instead of \$8,569,870, as proposed by the House and \$9,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; strike out the proposal of the Senate placing a limitation on funds available for personal services; and authorize the purchase of 9 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 19 as proposed by the House. A substantial portion of the increase allowed by the conference committee over the House figure is provided for the Bureau of Motor Carriers for purposes other than safety work. No part of the increase is for the valuation of pipelines or railroads. It is the understanding of the conferees that an increase of \$100,000 recommended in the bill as reported to the House for the Section of Certificates of the Bureau of Motor Carriers shall be applied to use by the Section of Complaints of that Bureau.

Amendment No. 53—Railroad safety: Inserts the provision of the Senate placing a limitation of \$743,700 on funds available for personal services.

Amendment No. 54—Locomotive inspection: Inserts the provision of the Senate placing a limitation of \$540,000 on funds available for personal services.

#### MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 55 and 56—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$34,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$36,500 as proposed by the Senate; and strike out the provision of the Senate placing a limitation on funds available for personal services.

#### NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Amendments Nos. 57, 58, and 59—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$49,250,000 instead of \$48,112,980 as proposed by the House and \$51,362,500 as proposed by the Senate; strike out the provision of the Senate placing a limitation on funds available for personal services; and authorize the purchase of four passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of eight as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 60—Construction: Reported in disagreement.

#### NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62—Land acquisition: Provide \$17,250 for personal services, instead of \$12,000 as proposed by the House and \$22,500 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the language of the House for "or other necessary expenses" stricken from the bill by the Senate.

#### SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$5,378,480 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$5,699,000 as proposed by the House; and insert a limitation on funds available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

#### SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Amendments Nos. 65 and 66—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$2,363,620 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,391,200 as proposed by the House; and insert the provision of the Senate placing a limit on funds available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 67 and 68—Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: Appropriate \$1,089,160 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,154,000 as proposed by the House; and insert the provision of the Senate placing a limit on funds available for personal services.

#### TARIFF COMMISSION

Amendments Nos. 69 and 70—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$1,144,600 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,259,300 as pro-

posed by the House; and insert the proposal of the Senate placing a limit on funds available for personal services.

#### TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Amendments Nos. 71, 72, 73, 74, and 75—Appropriate \$238,389,600, instead of \$236,139,600 as proposed by the House and \$240,639,600 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the purchase of two aircraft as proposed by the House, instead of one for replacement only as proposed by the Senate, it being the understanding of the conferees that two helicopters are to be purchased under this authorization; authorize the purchase of not to exceed 136 passenger motor vehicles of which 123 shall be for replacement only, instead of 190, of which 164 shall be for replacement only as proposed by the House, and not to exceed 82 for replacement only as proposed by the Senate; remove the limitation on funds available for personal services as proposed by the House; and insert the provision of the Senate prohibiting the use of funds for the operation and maintenance of aircraft for passenger service amended to provide that such operation and maintenance may not be provided unless the use of aircraft is confined specifically to use for official business by officers or employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

#### THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendments Nos. 76 and 77—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$818,000 as proposed by the House, instead of \$783,900 as proposed by the Senate; and strike out the proposal of the Senate placing a limitation on funds available for personal services.

#### VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 78, 79, 80, and 81—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$873,105,770 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$875,163,335 as proposed by the House; insert the proposal of the Senate placing a limitation on funds available for personal services other than hospital, domiciliary, and outpatient care and strike out the provision of the House placing a limitation on funds available only for medical, hospital, and domiciliary services; authorize the purchase of 37 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 74 as proposed by the House, and authorize the use of \$7,388,000 for repair and alterations to facilities as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$6,838,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 82, 83, and 84—Hospital and domiciliary facilities: Appropriate \$27,505,080 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$27,955,440 as proposed by the House; insert the limitation of the Senate on funds available for personal services; and restore the provision of the House authorizing the purchase of additional passenger motor vehicles.

#### WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 85—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$850,000, instead of \$800,000 as proposed by the House and \$900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 86—Purchase of passenger motor vehicles: Reported in disagreement.

#### TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### Maritime Activities

Amendments Nos. 87 and 88—Operating-differential subsidies: Reported in disagreement. In connection with amendment No. 88, the conferees on the part of the House point out that for several years the House has been urging that the monopoly which presently exists in connection with operating-differential subsidy shipping contracts be broken. The former Maritime Commission showed little inclination to break the monopoly and it is believed that the present Federal Maritime Board is favoring the monopoly. The Present Maritime Board which

has been in office during the past year, has approved long-term contracts covering a maximum of 379 voyages for 2 companies and there are contracts for a maximum number of 842 voyages pending for 10 companies that have not been renewed, all of which are for companies which have heretofore enjoyed long-term subsidy contracts. It is the understanding of the conferees that the Maritime Administration, both past and present, in renewing these long-term contracts have increased the minimum and the maximum number of voyages by the present holders of contracts, rather than decreasing them, to the exclusion of new applicants. The members of the conference committee insist that the number of voyages of the companies who enjoy and have enjoyed the benefits of subsidized operating-differential subsidy contracts since the inception of the law in 1937 be reduced so that other companies or individuals who have not enjoyed these benefits be permitted to do so. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that a flat limitation of 1,522 voyages be allowed. That number is in excess of the number of voyages approved in recent years by 88. These subsidized voyages have increased practically every year. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that 307 of the 1,522 voyages allowed be set aside for companies who have not participated heretofore in these subsidies. The conferees are of the opinion that it is grossly unfair for a monopoly to exist between 13 or 14 companies in this field and that the monopoly should be broken.

Amendments Nos. 89, 90, 91, and 92—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$15,651,400 as proposed by the House, instead of \$16,200,350 as proposed by the Senate; insert the provision of the Senate placing a limitation on funds available for personal services; authorize the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of five as proposed by the House; and provide \$8,029,400 for administrative expenses as proposed by the House, instead of \$8,578,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 93, 94, 95, and 96—Maritime training: Appropriate \$3,724,500 as proposed by the House, instead of \$4,108,500 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the transfer of \$69,300 as proposed by the House, instead of \$77,000 as proposed by the Senate for use by the Public Health Service in connection with services rendered the Maritime Administration; authorize the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of four as proposed by the House; and insert the words "and other trainees" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 97—State marine schools: Restores the provision of the House appropriating \$683,000 for such purposes in lieu of the Senate provision appropriating \$1,206,800.

Amendment No. 98—Reimbursement for loss or damage to vessels requisitioned by the United States: Reported in disagreement.

#### TITLE III—EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

Amendment No. 99—National defense: Strikes out the provision of the House continuing the 1951 unexpended balance available for this purpose during the fiscal year 1952 and inserts the provision of the Senate in connection with this item.

#### TITLE IV—CORPORATIONS

##### Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 100—Federal National Mortgage Association: Authorizes the use of \$3,060,000 for expenses of this activity as proposed by the House, instead of \$3,260,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 101—Nonadministrative expenses, Federal National Mortgage Association: Restores the provision of the House



amended to clarify the type of expense to which the limitations shall apply.

Amendment No. 102—Prefabricated housing: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 103 and 104—Federal Housing Administration: Authorize the use of \$4,949,000 of funds available to the Administration for administrative expenses, instead of \$4,824,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,074,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation of the House on nonadministrative expenses increased to \$23,300,000, instead of \$22,320,000 as provided in the House bill.

Amendments Nos. 105, 106, and 107—Public Housing Administration: Authorize the use of \$12,780,000 for the expenses of this activity including \$9,500,000 appropriated under title I of this act, instead of \$8,240,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the purchase of three passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate, instead of seven as proposed by the House; and restore the provision of the House placing a limitation of \$33,000,000 on funds available for nonadministrative expenses.

#### *Inland Waterways Corporation*

Amendment No. 108—Purchase of equipment: Reported in disagreement.

#### *Corporations—General Provision*

Amendment No. 109—Purchase of passenger motor vehicles: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 110—Limitation on persons employed or acting as chauffeur of Government-owned passenger motor vehicles: Reported in disagreement.

#### TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 111—Annual leave: Strike out the proposal of the Senate limiting such leave to 20 days during the fiscal year 1952, it being the understanding of the conferees that such subject is adequately covered under amendment No. 112.

Amendment No. 112—Limitation on annual leave to civilian officers and employees: Reported in disagreement. If changes made by this amendment in annual leave give to the "blue-collar" workers an hourly pay scale lower than that prevailing in the area as paid by private industry for the same or similar type of work, the wage board or administrative authority, having authority to adjust or fix the salaries of such employees, is directed to adjust all rates set by them to place said blue-collar workers on a parity with rates of pay in the area as paid by private industry for the same or similar type of work.

Amendment No. 113—Publicity, propaganda, and other information personnel: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 114—Prohibition against the appointment of personnel and reduction in funds available for personal services: The recommendation of the conferees will eliminate both the Senate and House provisions.

Amendment No. 115—Appropriations or authorizations for the acquisition of passenger motor vehicles: Strikes out the provision of the Senate in this connection, appropriate reductions having been made by the conferees in the individual items in the bill.

Amendment No. 116—Corrects the section number.

CLARENCE CANNON,  
ALBERT THOMAS,  
ALBERT GORE,  
GEORGE ANDREWS,  
SIDNEY R. YATES,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the minority of that subcommittee I ask unanimous consent that we may insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point a statement on behalf of the minority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

#### STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF MINORITY MEMBERS OF CONFERENCE ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

It will be apparent, when the House reads the conference report, on the independent offices appropriation bill, when it is filed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] on behalf of the conference, that it was not signed by the minority Members of the House.

There were several reasons for this. Primarily, there are two items, No. 46 and No. 105, which may be considered as one, on the number of housing units to be authorized, and No. 114, on the so-called Jensen-Ferguson personnel reduction, concerning which the House had expressed itself so recently, and so clearly, that the minority did not feel itself justified simply to yield to the Senate action. We felt that the least the conference should do was to report these items back in disagreement and ask for specific instructions.

The total requests for fiscal year 1952, in this bill, as it came from the Bureau of the Budget, were approximately \$6,800,000,000. The final figure for the cut is, we understand, approximately \$630,000,000. That is 9.2 percent. In the opinion of the minority that is not enough, in a time of national emergency. We felt it could be deeper.

Forty-seven of the 116 items had to do with money items on which the House and Senate figures differed. In 17 of these, where the Senate had reduced the House figure, the House receded and accepted the Senate figure, and in 7 the Senate receded. In 23, the conference split the difference between the two figures.

We point out to the House that the difference of opinion over the housing authorization involves not only item 46, which establishes the limit, for authorization, but also item 105, which will add \$4,540,000 to the administrative costs.

Certain changes in wording were left to the clerical staff to prepare, and the minority members also felt, in these instances, we did not want to sign without seeing the actual conference report. We felt that differences in policy, and in principle, are just as compelling in appropriation bills, as in legislative bills. We are in agreement on the majority of the 116 items under discussion in the conference. Other comments, both for and against conference decisions will be made when the report comes before the House for action.

JOHN PHILLIPS.  
FREDERICK R. COUDERT, JR.  
NORRIS COTTON.  
JOHN TABER.

#### CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 121, July 20, I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4740, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] had 2 hours and 17 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] had 1 hour and 37 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will yield some time now? I am not ready to put a speaker on at this time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, we are in this position: We have no requests whatever for time on this side.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman give me some additional time, then?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know what might happen later in the day.

As long as we are now speaking about time for speeches, may I suggest that hereafter when these mimeographed Republican speeches that emanate from the same mimeograph machine are sent to the Press Gallery the Members' names be spelled correctly. I cannot comprehend a Member's office sending a speech to the Press Gallery with the Member's name incorrectly spelled. If the gentleman would like to see one of them, I shall be glad to show it to him.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the gentleman comes from Brooklyn, too.

Mr. ROONEY. No, this gentleman comes from Ohio. His name is A-y-e-r-s, according to the press release. I understand the correct spelling of his name is A-y-r-e-s.

Mr. AYRES. May I say to the gentleman that I do not have a mimeograph machine in my office. I typed that speech up in my office. That name is quite often misspelled. The people that made the mimeographed copies for me made the error. If there is any doubt in the gentleman's mind, I should like him to pay a visit to my office. I would enjoy seeing him.

Mr. ROONEY. No, I accept the gentleman's explanation and will drop in for a social visit as soon as I have time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska desire to yield time?



Mr. STEFAN. I understand I have an hour and 37 minutes and the gentleman from New York has 2 hours and 17 minutes. I would like the gentleman from New York to yield some time until I have an opportunity to view the program here as to speakers. If the gentleman has no speakers to put on in this general debate, would the gentleman yield me additional time?

Mr. ROONEY. I cannot do that at this time, I must say to the gentleman from Nebraska. I do not know what the situation will be later in the day. If the gentleman from Nebraska is going to find himself short of time, when we get to that point I shall be glad to consider his request. We should not have any difficulty in that regard.

This bill in previous years never took more than a couple of hours to debate, but this year the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] wanted 8 hours for general debate. The Rules Committee decided upon 6 hours. I do not know what we are going to do with all this time.

Mr. STEFAN. We have plenty of speakers on this side, who could perhaps consume 8 hours on this very important bill, but I think in fairness the gentleman from New York should yield some time at this time in order that I can prepare my program.

Mr. ROONEY. Perhaps we can do so later.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman from New York yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska now?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not see any necessity for it. The gentleman's side has an hour and 37 minutes remaining as matters now stand. We do not have a speaker available at the moment. We would be glad to consider yielding your side part of our time later on in the day.

Mr. STEFAN. I have no speaker available at this time. I will have in a few minutes. Can the gentleman put somebody on?

Mr. ROONEY. How much time does the gentleman ask us to yield in addition to the time he already has?

Mr. STEFAN. Can the gentleman give us a half hour or an hour? The gentleman has 2 hours and 17 minutes. Give me 30 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. I will give the gentleman 20 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from New York indicates that he has no speakers.

The CHAIRMAN. If somebody does not yield time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand the parliamentary situation, Mr. Chairman.

The gentleman from New York has yielded me an additional 20 minutes; is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes. As a matter of fact, since the gentleman from Nebraska whom I greatly admire makes the request, we will make it the 30 minutes he originally requested.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield 30 minutes of his time to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield 30 minutes at this point to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Does that require the gentleman from Nebraska to remain standing during the course of the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

The CHAIRMAN. No. The Chair does not understand it that way. This is general debate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a most important responsibility of the Voice of America is to bring hope and encouragement to the enslaved peoples behind the iron curtain. The Voice is apparently failing to meet that responsibility.

I want to read to the House a number of comments on Voice of America broadcasts to Poland. These comments have been collected from letters and other messages by Polish writers and newspapermen. The material has been brought out of that unhappy country, in large measure, by recent refugees.

Among other things, the comments indicate that the Voice of America is still intent on protecting and defending the State Department for the Yalta, Potsdam, and other betrayals of freedom we have suffered. Because the Voice is concentrating on covering up past blunders by the United States Government, the Voice appears, in the words of one of these informants, "afraid or incapable even of strongly challenging the constant flow of anti-American Soviet propaganda."

Let me read some of these comments from Poles now or recently living in Poland. The comments are theirs, not mine:

#### COMMENT A

Voice of America broadcasts are mostly uninteresting, not sufficiently topical, too full of detailed news and comments about American internal affairs and events incomprehensible to Poles who cannot follow daily developments in the United States of America.

#### COMMENT B

News and comments on international affairs are usually presented from a wrong angle and often in a way which is irritating and even offensive to the Poles. The Voice of America broadcasters do not appear to understand Polish mentality and susceptibilities.

For instance: Tone and gist of such broadcasts is so increasingly favorable to Germany and the Germans that they create the impression that the United States Government intentionally wishes to provoke the Poles, who have suffered more than any other nation from German aggression, devastation,

extermination, brutality, and racialism, by exaggerated praise of German achievements and qualities.

On the other hand, news about Germany which would greatly interest the Poles—such as the possibilities and progress of rearmament in the three western zones of occupation in Germany against Communist aggression—are never mentioned.

#### COMMENT C

Too favorable comments and almost loving tone are broadcast on Tito's Yugoslavia and lavish praise about Tito's regime and its achievements. This exaggerated praise for a purely Communist government, imposed upon the people of Yugoslavia by a ruthless dictatorship, coming from the allegedly democratic United States of America, arouses logical doubts in Poland concerning American foreign policy. The Poles wonder if the United States Government is aware of what is really going on in Yugoslavia, or if the United States Government is becoming ideologically pro-Communist.

#### COMMENT D

Voice of America comments on Polish internal affairs and the Communist activities of the present regime are most superficial, belated and show ignorance of actual government trends in the Soviet-imposed task of sovietization.

The broadcasts entirely ignore and never counter the constant bitter attacks against the U. S. A. in books, in official Communist papers, leaflets, broadcasts, and press and other means of anti-American propaganda shrewdly and incessantly being spread in Poland under Moscow's orders.

Poles are coming to believe that the United States Government is still afraid of offending the Soviets and their imposed Polish Communist puppet government or that it lacks arguments to refute Communist accusations.

#### COMMENT E

Probably the weakest part of Voice of America broadcasts is its so-called humorous auditions, playlets, and witticisms. Their satire is of poor quality, low and childish. Their tone is such that it gives the Poles the impression that Americans regard them as half-wits and morons.

I have certainly seen evidence to substantiate that one, Mr. Chairman.

#### COMMENT F

Broadcasts about the activities of Americans of Polish descent (the so-called American Polonia) do not interest the Poles in Poland sufficiently to warrant accounts of events and ceremonies. On the other hand, they complain about the total absence of news about the fate and activities of the refugee Poles, of the Polish refugee press, of the Polish people now spread all over the world as refugees.

The Voice of America never mentions Polish professors or books written by Poles abroad. It has never given any news about the fate or whereabouts of Polish soldiers of General Anders and other formations of the Polish Allied Army which fought so gallantly shoulder to shoulder with the Western Powers in World War II. The fate and whereabouts of these people and their families naturally greatly interests the Poles in Poland.

#### COMMENT G

When one considers that special legislation has been passed by the United States Congress to enable additional immigration to the United States of Polish displaced persons and of 18,000 soldiers of the Polish Army and their families, that many thousands of these Poles have been received as immigrants in Latin-American countries and in Canada, it appears surprising, to say the least, that no mention of these facts should be made by



the Voice of America—the official American organ of American propaganda.

The Polish people conclude that the United States Government, still composed of New Dealers, supporters of the shameful Yalta and Potsdam deals on Poland, are anxious to avoid mentioning any facts which are even remotely connected with the existence of the Polish legal government and the Polish Army which fought in the invasion of Europe and in Italy after having sacrificed these allies and their native country for opportunistic reasons and agreed to Soviet domination over Poland.

It seems incredible that the Poles should hear of favorable American immigration laws for Polish soldiers through Radio Madrid and not directly from the United States of America.

I should say at this point, Mr. Chairman, that I am informed that the Voice of America has dealt with the soldiers of the Polish Army and the Polish displaced persons admitted to the United States. It would appear, however, that the Voice's statements cannot have been very frequent or strong, inasmuch as they do not seem to have made much impression.

#### COMMENT H

Generally speaking, practically all reports on Voice of America programs issuing from Poland express the opinion that they are uninteresting, drab, bureaucratic in tone, unconvincing.

They give the impression that they are prepared and spoken by clerks who do their job perfunctorily without any intelligent understanding of the human element or of Polish susceptibilities.

Please note the following, Mr. Chairman:

#### COMMENT I

Western radio broadcasts beamed to Poland are rated by the Poles as follows:

1. Radio Madrid is considered the best of all. It is interesting, topical, nonpartisan, informative, and is therefore widely listened to and acted upon, being regarded as a trustworthy anti-Communist directive.

2. The broadcasts of the British Broadcasting Corp. are regarded as next best.

3. In most recent reports the Liberty broadcasts of the National Committee for a Free Europe (N. Y.) are rated as somewhat improved. They are classed as third best after the two above-mentioned ones.

4. The Voice of America broadcasts come last. Very few of us here (in Poland) consider it worth while to lose time and run personal risks listening to the Voice of America program (June 1951).

I close Mr. Chairman with the following verbal message from reliable Polish leaders and press men which to me is particularly interesting. It was brought out of Poland by a refugee who managed to flee from that country in June 1951. I quote:

How can we learn the truth about American foreign policy? The United States is fighting the Soviet-led Chinese Reds in Korea. But local Communist propaganda tells us that Americans are not victorious and the proof advanced is that they cannot follow up their small temporary military advantages and have never dared bomb Manchurian bases. We are being told by Moscow-sponsored broadcasts that peace will soon be concluded on China Red terms and that Korea will be liberated together with Formosa from American imperialism. Also that the glorious Allied Chinese Peoples Democracy will replace the traitor Chiang Kai-shek in the UN.

Here it is again, Mr. Chairman. That proposed solution we have heard so often in recent months, attributed to Nehru and Attlee and often said to have the off-the-record, behind the scenes acquiescence of our own State Department.

I hope devoutly, Mr. Chairman, that this is propaganda and not fact. This would be a sorry ending to a war which has already cost us between \$7,000,000,000 and \$8,000,000,000 and perhaps 350,000 casualties.

But to return to the quotation:

This Soviet information is never refuted by the Voice of America. Are we to accept the Communist version?

We hear a lot from western broadcasts about Western European rearmament and General Eisenhower. The United States is openly rearming Europe in case of a third world war against the Soviets.

At the same time the Voice of America is full of praise for Tito's regime in Yugoslavia which is no less Communist and ruthlessly dictatorial than Soviet communism.

When are your Americans sincere? Are they sincere when they are anti-Soviet and anti-Communist or when they appear afraid to press their advantages in Korea and praise Tito communism?

The Voice of America does not clarify these problems. On the contrary, by its superficiality on all subjects and by avoiding to discuss vital ones, it only deepens our doubts. It does not ring true. The number of its Polish listeners has therefore been steadily decreasing. Tell your Americans that they are wasting their time trying to sell the American democratic way of life to us who are suffering under totalitarian communism imposed upon us at Yalta.

We have bought democracy long ago. What we want to know from the United States of America is if and when they will do something definite to help us throw off this yoke. Their pro-German sympathies, so evident in their Voice of America broadcasts, make us fear that, even if they do ultimately roll back the Soviets to their legal prewar boundaries of Russia proper, they may then approve of and participate in Poland's Prussianization as they approved of and participated at Yalta and Potsdam in our sovietization. Their verbal attacks on Soviet expansion and communism cannot inspire our confidence, as long as the United States Government upholds the Yalta agreements and as long as it appears afraid or incapable even of strongly challenging the constant flow of anti-American Soviet propaganda.

These extraordinary comments, Mr. Chairman, speak for themselves.

During the Eighty-first Congress, a Senate committee, following conferences with the heads of state and leaders of government in 16 countries and dependencies, "found ample evidence that our Voice of America, our State Department, and American foreign policy have not been successful in meeting the Communist propaganda."

The hearings on this bill indicate that the State Department over the years has been "beseiged from field offices around the world with suggestions, demands, and requests to correct the programing of the Voice of America."

Criticism has been directed at program content. It has been directed at methods. It has been directed at personnel.

Some of the radio scripts which I have personally seen have been absolutely

worthless. Some of them, in my opinion, have been actually harmful.

In his speech of April 9, 1951, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] referred to "specific instances of grossly improper management, where the taxpayers' dollars were thrown down the drain pipe by the people in charge of this program."

Other instances of failure to cooperate with the Congress appear in the hearings on this bill.

Within the funds made available by the Congress, the agency has made it possible for State Department personnel to make no less than 354 speeches in 29 States in a period of 18 months. It has also found it possible to pay some \$500,000 to the Gallup poll and other commercial firms to evaluate the work it has been trying to do.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the objectives of the Voice of America. Their attainment, in my judgment, is of tremendous importance under present conditions.

I am opposed, however, to spending hundreds of millions of dollars for a Voice of America whose work to date I heard characterized in Europe by high authority only a month ago as "pitiful."

Surely it should be possible to marshal the enormous advertising skill in this country and to apply it through skillful and trustworthy personnel, by methods which will assure results that are vital not only to America but to the entire Western World.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, for several years we have been told how Russia refuses to let American magazines and moving-picture films be distributed in Russia. We have been told that the same is true as far as iron-curtain countries are concerned. We know they jam and do everything to stop our radio programs. It is general knowledge that any dissemination of information to the people of Russia and iron-curtain countries is not permitted in any way.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter along those lines. I do not know whether or not all House Members receive an information bulletin from the Embassy of the U. S. S. R. at 2112 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, or not. Our office has received a copy twice monthly for several years. I did not ask for it or buy it. Anyone can obtain it at the subscription rate of \$2.40 per year, \$2 for 10 months, 10 or more copies to one address \$1 per subscription, sample copy free. Checks payable to the Information Bulletin of the Embassy of the U. S. S. R. It also states, "Material herein may be quoted or reproduced with or without credit."

This information was taken exactly as it appears on the inside of the front cover. If it is published twice monthly at the U. S. S. R. Embassy in Washington, they must have a large modern press. If it is published outside the Russian Embassy, and by a publishing concern in the United States, the owner or owners must be rather funny Americans.



Inasmuch as H. R. 4740, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, is before the House I feel it is in order to call your attention to the U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin which is one of Russia's known ways of disseminating information in the United States. This appropriation bill calls for an expenditure of \$85,000,000 for information. This is under title one of the bill, and is the subcommittee amount for international information now before the House. It was reduced by the committee to that amount by \$30,000,000 in the budget estimate.

Remember, the eighty-five million is only a part of the total for the Department of State. A great deal of the eighty-five million is for the Voice of America. I believe in advertising, but even with the committee reduction eighty-five million is still quite an advertising expense.

The Bureau of the Budget report for fiscal year 1951-52 on page 772 states under international information that radio programs are developed, produced, and transmitted from 38 transmitters in the United States and from overseas relay stations. It calls for daily broadcasts in the 1951 Campaign of Truth by furnishing radio receivers free to individuals in certain foreign countries.

From the U. S. S. R. Bulletin I want to read you how the Russians broadcast their viewpoint to Americans, to Communists, and sympathizers, to anyone in the United States who will listen. On owning a short-wave radio, to those in the back of their bulletin, possibly published in the United States and certainly sent out from the Russian Embassy here, they show, Moscow Radio broadcasts in English. I will read exactly from the magazine:

#### MOSCOW RADIO BROADCASTS IN ENGLISH

Radio programs in English are broadcast daily and Sunday from Moscow to the United States on the following schedule:

All time used in eastern standard.

Daily evening programs of news, political commentary, and side lights on Soviet life are broadcast from 6:20 p. m. to 10:58 p. m. on the following bands: 15.23, 11.88, 11.82, 9.67, 7.29, and 7.24 megacycles.

All programs begin with the news and a review of the press. These are followed by comment on Soviet or international subjects.

The following special features are included in the evening programs:

Mondays: Programs for farmers.

Tuesdays: Programs for youth.

Wednesdays: Scientific and cultural programs.

Thursdays: Programs in Russian for American Slavs.

Friday: Literary and musical programs entitled "In the Republics of the Land of the Soviets."

Saturdays: Economic reviews, weekly sports reviews, replies to letters from listeners.

Sundays: Concerts.

Will Russia let our Embassy in Moscow mail out such a magazine and information to Russians? She will not. Will she let our radio programs be broadcast to her own people and satellite nations? She will not.

I know under our Constitution we have, or are supposed to have, free speech and press. Here is one place I am willing to bypass the Constitution until this present situation is over. We may not be able to stop the publication and mailing of this pamphlet, but we can jam Russia's radio program.

KARL STEFAN, a member of the committee and who broadcasted for our Government to Czechoslovakia and the Philippines during the Japanese occupation, tells me that a Washington taxi driver turned on his radio and called Mr. STEFAN's attention to one of these Russian broadcasts. Mr. STEFAN informs me that any ham radio operator can jam this program of Russia's to the United States. They can jam it for little or nothing.

Why not jam it by the ham operators, the Federal Communications Commission, the Department of State, and everyone else who can do it? It should be done regardless of the Constitution. Why not fight communism fire with fire?

Why should this Government let Russia broadcast to American youths on Tuesdays? The Thursday's programs in Russian for American Slavs should certainly be jammed. Why not jam the whole works—Constitution notwithstanding?

If KARL STEFAN tells me any ham operator can jam this program at no cost, why not get it done? I believe the gentleman from Nebraska knows whereof he speaks.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that Congress refuse to pass the State Department appropriation bill until the State Department makes an honest, sincere, and courageous attempt to free Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis, Jr.; and until they adopt a policy which will command respect abroad of America and American citizens.

I also hereby request the House Foreign Affairs Committee, whom I deeply respect, to cease for a moment in their debate of how many billions of dollars they shall give away and consider the resolutions before them on the Oatis case which attempt to restore the respect that is due American citizenry on foreign soil.

In the case of businessman Robert Vogeler, who spent 17 months in the prisons of Hungary, and Consul General Angus Ward, captive of Red China for 13 months, there is monumental evidence to the fact that the State Department will do nothing until it is forced by Congress or by public opinion.

A country's standing among the nations of the world is not measured by the gold in its vaults nor by the size of its armies, but it is measured by the respect accorded its citizens by other nations. The respect of the world is one of the greatest heritages that a nation can bestow upon its citizens.

We all remember the story of Paul who, when arrested, declared "I am a Roman born," and was accorded the

respect the rights that citizens of the greatest country of that time received no matter where they wandered.

Americans have died on a thousand battlefields to establish and maintain that pride and the meaning of "I am an American." That sacred torch has been held high by men of all parties. Jefferson saw to it that the sacred right of citizenship in the United States was respected even by the Barbary pirates on the shores of Tripoli. Madison even allowed this Capitol to burn rather than allow the name of an American citizen to be insulted and trampled in the dust. To Jackson, the fact of being an American meant more than life itself. It is a great line of great Americans who have seen to it that the rights of an American citizen be respected in every corner, in every country, on every sea of this old world—Lincoln and McKinley; Teddy Roosevelt, who said "Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead!" and Perdicaris was released alive; Cleveland and Wilson; Hoover and Franklin Delano Roosevelt—they had many different economic and political views but they all held sacred the right of the American citizen and the protection that was due each citizen.

So, too, we have had a great list of Secretaries of State who down through history have stood as citadels of protection in maintaining the rights of the American citizens abroad. There have been Monroe and Calhoun, Webster and Hay; Olney and Root; Bryan, Lansing, and Hughes; Kellogg and Stimson; Hull and Byrnes.

Something has happened in America in the last few years. Perhaps it is because of the philosophy of "America last" seems to be dominating the thinking of too many. Why anyone would take pride in belonging to that group of "America-lasters" is more than I can understand.

Today it would seem that America rewards our enemies and forgets our friends. We give special trade concessions to help those nations that are unfriendly to us, such as Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Today we are buying Czechoslovakian goods to the extent of more than \$30,000,000 a year. We are giving them this trade to the detriment of our American business and labor. We are charging the Czechs just half the regular tariff rate, which is also to the detriment of American labor. Our markets are flooded, for example, with that blue glassware from Czechoslovakia, but we gave them good American gold in return for it. We are also giving England billions of dollars while they in turn ship supplies to Red China to kill American soldiers.

Why should any country respect the rights and lives of our American citizenry today? Out of this kind of dealings with foreign countries can only come disrespect. Out of this disrespect, this lack of decisive and firm action, can only come eventual war.

How far can we let foreign countries go in imprisoning and torturing our citizens? Do we let them get by with one, or two, or five? If so, why not



20, 50, or 100? Our American philosophy has been that every man is endowed with the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" and that any one life is just as important as any other in these United States.

If we cannot or will not command respect for American citizenry in Czechoslovakia, then let us bring our American citizens back to America and quit sending American gold and aid to Czechoslovakia. If we do not, soon the situation will arise which will make war inevitable. We are all opposed to war but we also know that a weak, vacillating, cowardly policy, ignoring the dignity of being an American, will bring war quicker than any other course.

As to Korea, in January of 1950 our Secretary of State said in effect that we would not defend the rights of our friends, the South Koreans. Some 140,000 American casualties attest to the results of such a statement.

Bill Oatis was an honest, respected, loyal American from my home State. Oatis belonged to that great group of American newspapermen who must always be kept free. His only crime was that of being an honorable American citizen doing his job of reporting the news fairly and honestly. Now he is a felon, convicted by a kangaroo court run by hooligans. Czechoslovakia is insulting the American flag and American citizenry. Yet it flies the same UN flag that floats so freely here in these United States.

When we think of the great men who have sat in this distinguished Hall, does not such an incident make your face burn with shame. At least let us quit giving American gold to finance that kangaroo court in Czechoslovakia. Let us have enough pride and guts to deserve the 175 years of heritage that great Americans have so fearlessly given to us.

We all know that the only hope that we have to restore that respect is through some action of Congress and through American public opinion. Therefore, I am appealing today to you in your consideration of the State Department appropriations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to force some action. I am still for a strong, highly respected America as against the philosophy of the "America-laster."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER].

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I compliment my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY] for so ably presenting the case of another Hoosier who now is imprisoned behind the walls of a Czechoslovakian prison.

The need for a hard-hitting Voice of America that will declare to the world that our country believes in freedom has been brought home most forcibly by recent events to the people of the district in Indiana that I have the honor to represent. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, and the right to a fair trial were put to test in the case of William Oatis, a news correspondent, now imprisoned in Czechoslovakia.

I have been advised that when the officials of the Voice of America appear

before the House Appropriations Committee they usually present grandiose figures on the size of the audience that supposedly is listening to the Voice around the world. When members of the Appropriations Committee try to pin these figures down and discover what basis they have in fact, the Voice people speak only vaguely of the difficulties of finding out exactly how many people are listening.

There is available a report dated March 26, 1951, to the Department of State in Washington from Donald R. Mann, its Public Affairs Officer in Habana. In this report Mr. Mann discusses the results of a radio survey in Cuba by the Asociacion de Anunciantes de Cuba—Cuban Advertisers' Association. Here is an excerpt from Mr. Mann's report:

In the national survey covering the Voice of America, 26,136 homes were visited during Voice of America program hours, of which 23,483 possessed radios, and 9,720 of these were turned on. The time of rating for the Voice of America hours was 40, which means that 300,000 of the estimated 750,000 sets in Cuba were turned on. Twenty-two persons were found listening to the Voice of America, which gave the programs an average rating of 0.093. This covers the entire 3 hours of programs, both English and Spanish. The average rating of 0.093 when projected against the number of sets results in a total of 697 listeners during the 3 hours. \* \* \*

The 0.093 average rating for the Voice of America for the 3 hours of programs compares this way with the three principal networks during the same listening period: CMI with an average rating of 16.8; RHC, 11.5; and Union Radio, 5.0.

I want to repeat what this radio survey showed out of 26,136 homes that were visited throughout Cuba, 22 persons were found to be listening to the Voice of America. This results in an average rating of nine one-hundredths of 1 percent compared to ratings as high as 16.8 percent for the three principal networks during the same listening period.

Mr. Mann also reported:

CMOX, the Habana English language station, known as the Cuban-American Radio, which rebroadcasts the Voice of America news in English and also uses Voice's recordings, had no listeners, according to the survey.

Mr. Mann's report speaks for itself. The Voice of America is not reaching the people of the world. The United States is falling down on psychological weapons, which should be one of our mainstays. I repeat, most Members of this House agree on the urgent need for a hard-hitting Voice that will bring the story of freedom and democracy to the other peoples of the world. Day by day, the evidence is mounting that the Voice of America, as now managed and operated, is about as hard-hitting as a creampuff. Improvements certainly are necessary.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Has the gentleman ever visited the Voice of America in New York and witnessed a Voice of America broadcast?

Mr. BEAMER. I am sorry to say I have visited it on only two occasions to see demonstrations of the Voice of America. Then I realized it was propaganda trying to sell us on the Voice, rather than selling the principles for which this country stands.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I have visited the Voice of America and have heard some of the programs. I fortunately understood some of the languages that were being beamed. I must say that the Voice of America had an effective program being beamed to the various countries where they could be reached. Of course, we know that they cannot reach all of the world with the appropriations we are giving them, but they are doing a very good job with the amount of money they have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] has expired.

(Mr. BEAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

#### THE GREENWOOD PLAN

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, last summer, Chauncey W. Lever, manager of the Greenwood (S. C.) Chamber of Commerce, read of an address by a prominent American urging that a Marshall plan of ideas be created so that the United States could more effectively present its side in the cold war. The address had stated that America was losing the cold war by not successfully combating the lies of communism.

In a telegram to the speaker, Lever suggested that each chamber of commerce in the United States set up a local committee which would gather ideas from citizens of the community on how to pierce the iron curtain and promote world freedom and peace, screen the ideas, and send the best to a centralized idea agency that would pass the ideas on to the Voice of America or any medium used to combat communistic ideology.

The suggestion stirred the imagination of the press and radio of the Nation and became known as the Greenwood plan. Although urged by every quarter of the Nation to conduct a national program, the Greenwood Chamber of Commerce was not equipped to do so. However, a committee known as the Greenwood Plan Committee, composed of persons of varied occupations and interests, was appointed to gather ideas from citizens of Greenwood County and to begin a long-range program to further acquaint local citizens with the philosophy of communism, its lies and its deceptions. A varied program has been carried out and is still in progress in Greenwood County.

When the Crusade for Freedom began its campaign last fall it was realized that the aims of the crusade were similar to those of the Greenwood plan. Three members of the Greenwood Plan Committee went to New York and offered the Greenwood plan to Gen. Lucius D. Clay,



national chairman of the Crusade for Freedom, suggesting that he use the plan in any manner he believed feasible in the work of the Crusade for Freedom. General Clay and his associates received the idea with enthusiasm and resolved that the Greenwood plan retain its own identity while affiliated with, and sponsored by, the Crusade for Freedom.

The national headquarters of the Greenwood plan were appropriately set up in Greenwood, S. C. Chauncey Lever, the originator of the Greenwood plan, was given a leave of absence from the Greenwood Chamber of Commerce to serve as executive director, and is assisted by David W. Cole, head of the department of history of Lander College.

On June 25 of 1951 a national campaign was launched by sending each chamber of commerce in the United States, Hawaii, and Alaska an invitation to join in the battle against world communism. An attractive mailing piece outlined the aims of the Greenwood plan and told how the individual community could begin a program to obtain ideas from its citizens on how to pierce the iron curtain and promote world freedom and peace. To those chambers of commerce that indicated a desire to join in the Greenwood plan a kit was forwarded which gave detailed information on how to put the program in operation. So far, over 300 communities, representing every State, Alaska, and Hawaii, have joined the Greenwood plan.

The ideas that are accumulated by local Greenwood plan committees will be screened and the best will be forwarded to the State Crusade for Freedom Committee. The State Crusade Committee, after screening ideas, will send the best to Radio Free Europe to be used in its slugging attack upon communism as it exists behind the iron curtain. A secondary feature of the Greenwood plan, but equally important, is the intensive study of communism that is recommended, a study which will no doubt be followed by a rededication of the American people to the American way of life—a system which allows every freedom for which mankind has ever struggled as opposed to communism, which offers slavery and death.

The beauty of the Greenwood plan is that it gives every American the opportunity to fight communism personally by allowing him to contribute his idea on how it might be defeated. Each American who contributes his idea is assured that it will be given careful consideration and will be put to constructive use. One of the slogans of the Greenwood plan program is "Your idea may be the one that gives hope to some imprisoned person behind the iron curtain." Thus, ideas gathered through the Greenwood plan and used by Radio Free Europe will show the peoples captured by communism that America is dedicated to the defeat of their captors.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN].

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, today one of the most pressing questions in the mind of every American is: How

long is the present world-wide tension between the free world and the Kremlin going to last? Of course, no one can give a definite answer. However, many of us are beginning to face realities enough to realize that it may last for a long time. It is at least foolish to proceed on any other basis.

To win in this mortal struggle for survival, we must not continue to wage just defensive efforts. We must take the offensive in waging peace. We must attack the job with the same vigor, determination, and challenge with which we have so successfully waged military offensives.

To wage the peace intelligently and successfully, we must carefully analyze the danger that threatens us. The Soviet Union has been and is now carrying on a completely new kind of war against the non-Communist world. In this new and to us strange type of attack, we must clearly understand that from the Kremlin point of view and objective, the military is just one of four major fronts. The four fronts are military, economic, political, and psychological. While the Kremlin wages unremitting war against the free world along these four fronts, if we survive, we must effectively wage the peace along these same four fronts.

This over-all and seemingly evenly balanced attack on the free world by the Kremlin is the compelling reason why we must give adequate attention to each of these four equally important fronts. Should we win on one front and lose on the other three, we will still be losing our essential objective. If we continue to exist as a free people, we must win on all four of these fronts. Therefore, it is just common sense that we take the offensive equally effective on all four fronts. To single out one of these fronts and destroy its effectiveness is just about equal to inviting failure and disaster to our over-all purposes.

The United States information program is the backbone of the free world's psychological offensive. Then, the Voice of America which is the voice of freedom must be adequately supported. We must effectively take the offensive in the struggle for the minds of men.

On the psychological front, the Soviet Union spends billions to breed strife, suspicion, and distrust among men everywhere. They buy and pay for the full time of thousands of people to do nothing but create and magnify discord and division. They turn the employer against the employee, and the middle class against the peasant. They magnify minor political and economic differences into major discord. Their main working capital is insecurity. A major investment is in the manufacture of hate. They use the poverty and discord which they work so carefully to produce to make alluring their own false pretenses of helping to bring peace and plenty to the masses.

In such a conflict, each of the four fronts is of vital importance. Each must be adequately supported. Each must be carefully and effectively used. We must wage a balanced offensive on a complete front. The proposed appropriation

of \$85,000,000 carried in H. R. 4740 for the Voice of America is of more importance than the rather meager sum in the over-all figure would indicate. During the next fiscal year, we will spend sixty-five to seventy billion dollars in our efforts to remain a free nation in a free world. Then eighty-five million becomes a very modest effort on so vital a weapon in our offensive survival. I will support an amendment to increase the appropriation. I earnestly urge all my colleagues to support such an amendment. Let us wage a balanced offensive for a free world.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, as a result of our bungling foreign policy for the past 5 years we have suffered more than 160,000 casualties in Korea and that is just the beginning. For the past 5 years the people of America have been waiting for this day. They have been waiting for the appropriation bill to come up for the Department of State. This is the division of our Government that has made such a shameful botch—Korea, Yalta, Potsdam, and the United Nations. At this fateful day I am ashamed of my party leaders, to whom the people of America are looking, that at this tragic and fateful hour they have made a compromise with the majority leaders to call up this bill when there would be no quorum calls so that the people of America might know what is going on.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I made no such compromise with either side.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am not referring to the members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason I am going to make a point of order, and insist on it, that a quorum is not present so that the American people will be represented here when this great discussion is going on on something that concerns the future of America and the future of every young man and woman in this country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad to see the gentleman is here today.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I want to say if the gentleman will look at my roll calls in the last 9 years I have answered just as many roll calls as has the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Let us compare the records in the more interesting last 3 weeks or 3 months or the last year. The gentleman from Wisconsin knows very well that there is a primary election in Pennsylvania today. It is perfectly all right with me, I have no objection to what the gentleman is doing, but I will say that the gentleman is one of the few Members of this House who is not entitled to make the statement he did just now. I am confident that my attendance record in the 7½ years I have been here will compare very favorably with the gentleman from Wisconsin's 9 years,



I suggest the gentleman insert the details in the RECORD.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am not embarrassing any Member. I have never as a Member of Congress asked special consideration in considering legislation when I could or could not be here. If the Pennsylvania delegation could not be here the bill could have been delayed a day or two. And I repeat again that over the 9-year period I have been in Congress I have answered more roll calls than has the gentleman from New York and I feel that his attempted reflection is entirely uncalled for. I insist on my point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. STEFAN.

The Committee divided.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the Chair count the Members on the minority side who have remained seated during this teller vote, or must they rise and pass through the middle aisle?

The CHAIRMAN. After the tellers report, the Chair will count all Members in the Chamber.

The tellers reported that there were—ayes 0, noes 73.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eleven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss what I regard as one of the most amazing performances to date by the State Department's so-called Department of Public Affairs, which operates such programs as the Voice of America, United States Information Service, and so forth.

Perhaps some of you will recall that last December a Mr. Norman Cousins was sent to Asia by the Department of State on what professed to be a lecture tour, paid for and financed by funds out of the United States Treasury. According to the expense account turned in by Mr. Cousins after his return, he lived at the expense of the Department of State from December 31, 1950 through March 16, 1951, and was compensated for 75 days at the rate of a \$500 per month salary. His over-all charge was \$4,550.

On May 11 of this year, I addressed a letter to Mr. Edward W. Barrett, the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, making inquiry about the purpose of Mr. Cousins' trip, and the purpose of the State Department in sending him abroad. The letter must have occasioned some surprise because I did not get a

reply until May 28—2½ weeks later. I will put Mr. Barrett's letter in the RECORD:

MAY 28, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN TABER,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TABER: I refer further to your letter of May 11, in which you inquire concerning the recent trip of Mr. Norman Cousins to Southeast Asia, and request data relative to other projects of similar nature which have been or are being financed by the Government.

As you know, the Department conducts an international educational exchange program, pursuant to authority contained in the Smith-Mundt Act, the Fulbright Act and the Finnish War Debt Act, under which American professors, research scholars, teachers, students, and leaders and specialists in various fields of endeavor are sent abroad and persons in these categories are brought to the United States on grants-in-aid awarded by the Department, the over-all purpose being to promote American understanding and friendship among the peoples of other countries. The Department is, of course, constantly endeavoring to discover means by which the fullest possible realization of this objective can be achieved.

In furtherance of this aim, officers of the bureau concerned with South Asian affairs in the Department felt that in view of his prominence in the America world of letters, Mr. Cousins would be the type of person who might be well suited to undertake a project of lecturing on the American way of life before foreign audiences, especially in certain areas where the United States is too little understood. It was believed that, as a well-informed, successful private citizen, he could articulate the United States position in world affairs, and could command a sympathetic reaction to our point of view from influential groups which have been critical of our policies. The Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs and I approved of the choice of Mr. Cousins and officers in the Office of Educational Exchange concurred. He was, accordingly, awarded a grant-in-aid for the purpose of lecturing on various aspects of American life at United States Information Centers and before other interested groups in Ceylon, India, and Pakistan. He likewise visited Japan, Hongkong, and Singapore, although these points were not included in his lecture assignment. In India, Mr. Cousins delivered lectures in Madras, Calcutta, New Delhi, and Bombay. In Pakistan, he addressed groups in Dacca, Lahore, and Karachi.

Reports describing the results of his visit and clippings from local newspapers submitted by our missions have been extremely gratifying, and, judging by them, I believe it may be said that Mr. Cousins accomplished a great deal toward refuting many popular misconceptions which are held abroad about the United States. The Department believes his lecture tour succeeded in increasing among the people of the countries he visited a respect for and understanding of the people of this country and of the problems we face.

Inasmuch as a final voucher has not as yet been submitted by Mr. Cousins for payment, I am unable at this time to tell you the exact cost of his lecture tour. However, he was authorized all necessary transportation, a compensation at the rate of \$500 a month, and a per diem in accordance with standardized Government travel regulations, the stipulation being that the assignment was to be for a period not to exceed 75 days.

Although Mr. Cousins was the first to participate in this type of general lecturer project, in view of the widespread interest his lecture tour evoked, the Department is now contemplating the possibility of arranging other assignments of similar nature which might profitably be undertaken.

If there is further information concerning this matter which I can furnish you, I hope that you will not hesitate writing me again.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,  
Assistant Secretary.

I do not know why it took Mr. Barrett 17 days to answer my letter because the information in his reply was negligible, to say the least. So, on June 1, I wrote him another letter, asking for more information. The response to my second inquiry arrived 26 days later, on June 27, and I might as well tell you that my secretary had prodded them by telephone on an average of twice a week in the intervening 26 days.

At this point in my remarks I want to insert the full text of Mr. Barrett's second letter:

JUNE 27, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN TABER,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TABER: As requested in your letter of June 1, I am sending you under separate cover copies of reports from several of our American Foreign Service posts and clippings from local newspapers overseas relating to the recent lecture tour of Mr. Norman Cousins. I would appreciate it if you would have these papers returned for the department's files after you have had an opportunity to read them.

I believe you will find that the salient points of the speeches which Mr. Cousins gave in India, Pakistan, and Ceylon, are fairly well covered in the press reports which I am sending you. Since Mr. Cousins spoke to a large extent from notes and outlines, full texts are not available. You will note that these clippings are from newspapers of a wide variety politically. On balance, and read in the light of the reports from our Foreign Service establishments, they indicate especially Mr. Cousins' effectiveness in combating the Communist attack upon the United States as a nation of warmongers.

I am enclosing a report which covers items of expense for which Mr. Cousins has submitted statements to the Department. These claims are, of course, subject to review by the Department's Office of Budget and Finance, and it is not known at present whether they will be allowed in every case in the amounts indicated. As soon as I receive a final report of the total cost of Mr. Cousins' trip, I shall be glad to furnish you that information.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,  
Assistant Secretary.

(Enclosure: Report of expense.)

(Under separate cover: 1. From American Embassy, Colombo, Ceylon, despatch No. 553, January 25, 1951, with enclosures. 2. From American Consulate General, Bombay, India, despatch No. 971, April 24, 1951, with enclosures. 3. From American Consulate General, Lahore, Pakistan, despatch, April 23, 1951, with enclosures. 4. From American Embassy, New Delhi, India, despatch No. 2337, March 30, 1951, with enclosures. 5. From American Consulate General, Bombay, India, despatch No. 885, April 4, 1951, with enclosures.)

On July 5 I dispatched another letter to Mr. Barrett and on July 17, 12 days later, I received a reply to my third inquiry. Once again Mr. Barrett's office had been prodded several times by telephone from my secretary. I tell the House this because I want them to understand how Mr. Barrett's office established some sort of a world's record by replying in 12 days. That is evidently what they consider high-speed performance down there.



I place Mr. Barrett's third letter in the RECORD at this point:

JULY 17, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN TABER,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TABER: In your letter of July 5, you made additional inquiries regarding the recent lecture tour of Mr. Norman Cousins. You requested copies of reports from the American Foreign Service posts at Calcutta, Madras, Dacca and Karachi concerning Mr. Cousins' visit, and you inquired concerning the role of Mr. Julius Stulman in this tour.

The Department has not yet received reports from the posts in Calcutta, Dacca and Karachi covering Mr. Cousins' visit to those places.

The reports from Madras, dispatch No. 508 dated February 1, 1951 and dispatch No. 673 of March 21, 1951, together with accompanying newspaper clippings, are enclosed. You will note from the latter dispatch that the Public Affairs Officer at Madras in a letter to the editor of the *Liberator* took exception to a statement appearing in the January 19, 1951, issue of that newspaper (Enclosure No. 1 to dispatch 508) which referred to Mr. Julius Stulman, Mr. Cousins' traveling companion on this trip, as a "Communist." The editor's note acknowledges that, as used in the context of the news article, the word was intended to denote "community-minded." The enclosed dispatches, together with those previously forward to you, constitute all of the communications from the American Foreign Service posts which are on file in the Department regarding the activities of either Mr. Cousins or Mr. Stulman—except for one item mentioned below.

With regard to Mr. Stulman's presence on Mr. Cousins' trip, I understand that he is a personal friend of Mr. Cousins and that he accompanied him at the latter's request. Mr. Stulman is head of the Stulman-Erick Lumber Co., of New York City. His purpose in visiting Southeast Asia is understood to have been an interest in exploring practical projects of technical development and organization and in discovering means of improving living standards in underdeveloped areas of the world. He paid all of his own expenses on this trip and traveled as a private citizen.

The report from Bombay which you requested is a classified report containing remarks about a private American citizen not traveling under Government auspices or at Government expense which could be embarrassing to the individual concerned and to the reporting officer. If you so desire, we would be glad to discuss this with you at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,  
Assistant Secretary.

(Enclosures: 1. From American consulate general, Madras, India, dispatch No. 508, February 1, 1951, with enclosures. 2. From American consulate general, Madras, India, dispatch No. 673, March 21, 1951, with enclosures.)

Meantime, on July 11, I dispatched a fourth inquiry to Mr. Barrett and I am happy to report that I got a reply to this letter in 8 days—on July 19. In fact, Mr. Barrett sent a man up to my office to deliver it to me by hand. I will not burden the RECORD with this fourth letter.

I cite this 2-months' ordeal of trying to get answers to four letters from the State Department as an example of why the whole propaganda program which the State Department is running is a flop. It moves with the speed of molasses on a cold day in Maine. The De-

partment of Public Affairs is so wound up in red tape, paper-pushing, memo writing, and bureaucracy that it is no wonder it gets nothing done. You have heard speech after speech in this House decrying our Voice of America as a boring flop which runs far behind events and which, in no sense of the word, could be described as an alert, up-to-the minute outfit.

Now as to this gentleman named Norman Cousins. In case you never heard of Mr. Norman Cousins, and I should be surprised if many Members of the House have, I want to tell you a few things about him.

He is 38 years old, once worked on the New York Post and then joined the Saturday Review of Literature, which is a little magazine devoted to reviewing books and phonograph records. It has some standing in the world of letters but it is more famous—if indeed it has any fame at all—for its agony columns and lovelorn personal ads. Its circulation is minute, indeed, compared to other magazines.

The Saturday Review of Literature has done its full share of lauding Communist books down through the years of Mr. Cousins' management, although the magazine has professed to be anti-Communist. I think a fair description, politically, of Mr. Cousins and his magazine would be fuzzy-minded. The magazine is typical of the confused thinking of so-called American intellectuals.

Inasmuch as the United States Government had never sent anybody abroad before on a trip of this kind, I wondered why it should pick out an obscure man like Mr. Norman Cousins for the initial experiment. I caused extensive inquiries to be made and I must tell you that the only reason I can discover for the selection of Mr. Cousins is that he happens to be a personal friend of Mr. Barrett. It seems that they used to ride to New York City together from Connecticut on the same train every morning. I suppose when we consider the limitations of this whole public affairs program and the quality of its administrators, we would be expecting too much from them to pick a sponsored speaker on any other basis. Certainly I would never expect them to pick somebody who might really represent America and who would be so prominent that his name might be recognized abroad.

I have before me Mr. Cousins' expense account, and I want to read it into the RECORD:

|                                                                                                   |          |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Per diem for the period Dec. 31, 1950, through Mar. 16, 1951-----                                 | \$768.00 |
| Salary compensation for 75 days at the rate of \$500 per month-----                               | 1,250.00 |
| International travel-----                                                                         | 2,301.27 |
| Local travel-----                                                                                 | 131.65   |
| Passport-----                                                                                     | 10.00    |
| Inoculations, including plague, typhus, smallpox, cholera, tetanus, typhoid, and paratyphoid----- | 90.00    |
| Total-----                                                                                        | 4,550.92 |

Now let us see what we got for our \$4,550.92.

I hold in my hand what purports to be some press clippings gathered by our consular offices in southeast Asia and I

want to read you a few excerpts from them.

The first one is from the Ceylon Daily News in Colombo, and is dated January 16, 1951.

It described Mr. Cousins' speech in these headlines: "Need for world federal government—fastest growing movement in United States."

The second clipping is from the Ceylon Observer, published in the same city on January 16. The headline reads: "World government desperately necessary."

Now I want to quote you a paragraph from that news story concerning the speech delivered by Mr. Cousins in Colombo. Here is what he says:

I believe that it is desperately necessary to have a world-wide government in which nations could maintain their own institutions, accepting a high sovereignty in matters concerned with the security of the people. The world federal government is the fastest growing movement in the United States.

Mr. Cousins, in virtually every press clipping that I have seen, expounded on the thesis that world government is the desirable solution to everything.

For example, speaking in New Delhi, India, Mr. Cousins provokes the following headline, "Plea for world government."

The same idea is included in a report of Mr. Cousins' remarks carried in the Times of India on February 15, and in the Indian News Chronicle of February 17.

For example, the Free Press Journal on February 23 has this headline, "Formation of world government, Mr. Cousins' plea."

I do not know whether I have all the press clippings on Mr. Cousins' trip or not. I do know that I have all that the State Department would give me, and I would urge any Member who wishes to do so to look at this file and see for himself what we spent \$4,550.92 for.

I think Mr. Barrett and the State Department were possibly a little bit worried when I had the audacity to inquire about Mr. Cousins' trip.

I hold in my hand something that was never intended for my eyes, and I can imagine that there are going to be a few red faces in the State Department and its Public Affairs Department when I get through reading this piece of paper. It will show you what kind of tricks and deceitful practices are engaged in when a Member of Congress makes an inquiry as to what the State Department is doing with all the money that the taxpayers are giving it.

This piece of paper that I hold in my hand is a confidential memorandum which was circulated in the State Department as a result of my letter of June 1, and by some fortunate chance or other it got included by accident in the material sent to me, at my request, by the State Department.

It is dated June 13, 1951, and is titled "Memorandum."

It is addressed to Mr. William C. Johnstone, Mr. Charles M. Hulten, Mr. Edward W. Barrett.

The memorandum states that it is from Francis J. Colligan.



It states that the subject is: Attached letter to Congressman TABER.

Each of the gentlemen has placed his initials after his name, indicating that it was read by him. That is efficiency for you.

I want to quote from this surprising piece of paper which, I repeat, was never intended for my eyes:

Attached herewith you will find a reply for Mr. Barrett's signature to Congressman TABER's letter of June 1, 1951. The Foreign Service reports and clippings which Congressman TABER requested and which are being sent under separate cover are also attached. A review of the reports and clippings prompts the following comments:

1. The reports are good. They are well done and they indicate the over-all value of Mr. Cousins' trip.

2. The clippings cover a wide range of newspapers. It is hoped that Congressman TABER will consider each individual clipping for what it is worth and in the light of the over-all effect of Mr. Cousins' activities and the evaluation of them as contained in the Foreign Service reports.

3. Some of the clippings may raise certain questions; for example, the "plugs" for world federalism and the newspaper statement to the effect that Cousins thought that democracy was being "experimented with" in China (clipping B-1, New Delhi).

Now, I want to stop at this point in the memorandum and read you some remarks made in longhand writing in the margin at point 3. Somebody using blue ink has drawn lines under the words which asserted that Cousins thought that democracy was being "experimented with in China—clipping B-1, New Delhi." A person, who apparently signs himself R. A. P. in his own handwriting, penciled these words: "Paragraph of clipping cut off. Story complete without it."

I suppose Mr. Cousins is entitled to the opinion, if it is his opinion, that Chinese Communists are engaged in "experimenting with democracy," but I do not think it is Mr. Cousins' right to so state publicly on a trip financed by the State Department of our Government. Of course, he must realize that we have people in our State Department who have regarded the Communists in China for years as mere "agrarian reformers." And perhaps I should not censure Mr. Cousins at all.

But I think that the House will agree with me that when Members of Congress ask a department of this Government for a report of how money was spent, we do not need any little bureaucrats editing the answers for us with a pair of scissors.

I might say to the members of the press that I have had photographs made of this particular piece of bureaucratic conspiracy, and they are welcome to have copies of the photographs, if they wish.

Now, to continue reading to you from this remarkable memorandum which was circulated in the Public Affairs Department and which was sent to me quite by accident. It continues:

4. The reports may raise other questions. (a) For example, Cousins' changing the lecture topics agreed on with the Department before he left. (These changes were not important.) (b) Mr. Cousins' being accompanied by Mr. Julius Stulman, as reported

by Bombay. (NEA jumped the gun on this one by drafting a cable requesting courtesies, and so forth, for Mr. Stulman simply because Mr. Cousins thought Stulman's trip was important. We have a separate file on Mr. Stulman as a result of this incident, and we have called NEA's attention to the fact that they should not again take such action.)

5. Mr. and Mrs. McGhee met with Mr. Cousins in Bombay. (Mr. McGhee might be called upon by Mr. TABER to give his personal evaluation of Mr. Cousins' trip.)

These comments are prompted simply by the fact that, since we are sending these reports and clippings to Congressman TABER, he may after careful perusal of them have certain additional questions to ask. A reasonable review by him of these clippings and reports should lead to the conclusion that Cousins' trip was not a waste of money and, in fact, did much good.

Attachments:

1. Reply to Congressman TABER.

2. Clippings and reports.

OEX: IEP: FJColligan: emt.

Let us see what else this remarkable secret memorandum tells us:

A. We now discover that Mr. Cousins changed the subject of his lecture topics after he had left Washington, en route to southeast Asia.

We also note from Mr. Barrett's letter, which I read you earlier, that Mr. Cousins did not even speak from prepared texts, and therefore we must conclude that, unlike General MacArthur, the astounding Mr. Cousins was allowed to speak under official sponsorship without so much as submitting a single word to the State Department for clearance.

I hold in my hand a copy of the newspaper put out by the Democratic National Committee under the direction of William M. Boyle, Jr., national chairman of the Democratic Party. This particular issue was published immediately after President Truman had fired General MacArthur, and is devoted exclusively to Mr. Truman's lamentable mistake. The Democratic National Committee's newspaper publishes in full the White House press release which cites as an excuse for firing MacArthur that he had not cleared several of his utterances and other public statements, and it quotes a December 6, 1950, directive by President Truman as follows:

No speech, press release, or other public statement concerning foreign policy should be released until it has received clearance from the Department of State. \* \* \*

Officials overseas, including military commanders and diplomatic representatives, should be ordered to exercise extreme caution in public statements, to clear all but routine statements with their departments, and to refrain from direct communication on military or foreign policy with newspapers, magazines, or other publicity media in the United States.

I would like to point out to the House that this order evidently applied only to people who had the courage to speak up against the administration, inasmuch as Mr. Norman Cousins was speaking without State Department clearance throughout southeast Asia, on a trip financed by the State Department, during the same period that this administration was getting ready to fire General MacArthur.

I do not know what Mr. Cousins and his pet world government scheme hold

for the security of the American people, but I want to tell the House that General MacArthur is worth a million Norman Cousins. Certainly if General MacArthur had been fired for his utterances, then the State Department should be severely rebuked by the President for allowing Mr. Cousins to appear as an American spokesman scot-free of official clearance.

B. We also discover that the gentlemen down at the State Department were quite worried, according to this memorandum, about Mr. Cousins'—and I quote the memorandum—"plugs for world federalism."

C. We also discover that Mr. Cousins was not traveling alone. He was accompanied completely around the circuit by a Mr. Julius Stulman, who got his picture in the papers of southeast Asia along with Mr. Cousins, and who shared in some newspaper and radio interviews with Mr. Cousins.

I have learned that several of our consular officers in southeast Asia filed complaints to Washington about the presence of Mr. Stulman. Just what the real nature of these complaints was I do not know as Mr. Barrett wrote me that the reports were classified.

It appears that Mr. Stulman paid his own expenses everywhere, but it strikes me as extremely peculiar and coincidental that he should take this trip with Mr. Cousins, who at least enjoyed a semi-official position, which of course did Mr. Stulman no harm since he shared in it.

I have tried to make some inquiry about Mr. Stulman and I find he is a very wealthy New Yorker, with interests in about 15 corporations. I also learned that he is an ardent advocate of some sort of a mysterious economic reform program. He has spent considerable of his own money, promoting what seems to be an idea that only he is interested in.

I want to be perfectly frank with the House that I have next to no information about Mr. Stulman's part in the 75-day trip which he and Mr. Cousins took. Nor do I know what the complaints about Mr. Stulman from our foreign-service officers were. However, if I were a businessman interested in the financial success of 14 or 15 corporations, and if I were looking for some business in southeast Asia, I think I would like auspices such as Mr. Stulman traveled under. On the other hand, if I were the advocate of some vague economic reform program and I could get nobody in the United States to pay any attention to me, I might want to make the trip in the hope that somebody in southeast Asia might give me some recognition.

At any rate I should say that the Public Affairs Department is incapable of conducting the programs it undertakes when it sponsors and finances a trip half way around the world for a man who does not submit a single utterance for clearance, and who is accompanied by a businessman who enjoys at least quasi-official sponsorship.

Mr. Stulman was the beneficiary of a State Department cable directing all For-



eign Service personnel to extend him special "courtesies." And several official press releases from the United States Information Services at various points in southeast Asia mentioned Mr. Stulman's part in the trip. For example, the United States Information Service stationed in the United States Embassy in New Delhi had a press release on February 10 which stated:

Mr. Julius Stulman, American economist and industrialist, is accompanying Mr. Cousins in order to observe and study economic conditions in India.

In Madras, India, Mr. Stulman shared a press conference with Cousins, and it was Stanley Chartrand, the United States Information officer, who personally introduced Mr. Stulman to the press.

In conclusion concerning Mr. Stulman, it should be noted that there was considerable confusion among our various Foreign Service missions on what to do about him. In contrast to the official welcome he got in some places, a dispatch sent to the State Department from W. Clyde Dunn, American consul at Bombay, on April 4, 1951, states that one of the "limitations on effectiveness" of the Cousins trip was "the constant presence of Mr. Julius Stulman, his traveling companion."

Now to return to Mr. Cousins' role on this Marco Polo journey in reverse:

Not only did Mr. Cousins spend most of his time promoting world government, but in virtually every city he visited, he managed to take cracks at the American press. Just to cite you a couple of examples out of many, he is quoted in the January 18 issue of the Times of Ceylon as follows:

He did not think newspapers and magazines in the United States reflected the true public opinion.

One Indian journal even expressed surprise at the contempt with which Mr. Cousins evidently regarded the American press. The publication Bharat commented on February 25 as follows:

It was surprising to hear an outstanding American journalist asking this country not to take the American press as reflecting the public opinion there.

I am not a reader of the Saturday Review of Literature, but I am told that the most it reflects publicly is the opinion of Mr. Cousins and a coterie of nickel-and-dime intellectuals as to their views on books and phonograph records.

I am certain of one thing, however. I can guarantee the House that the American press as a whole is far more accurate and far more representative of American public opinion than Mr. Norman Cousins himself.

When Mr. Cousins praises world government and represents it as "the fastest growing movement in the United States," he not only displays a colossal ignorance, but raises doubts in my mind whether he could get a job as a cub reporter on the Daily Bugle in "Sadie's Switch, Okla."

I hold in my hand a press clipping dated July 10 of this year which announces that the monthly magazine Common Cause, published in Chicago and founded 4 years ago as the official organ of the Committee To Frame a

World Constitution, has gone out of business. The story says that the highest circulation the magazine achieved was in 1948 when 4,000 copies were distributed. The news report adds that the circulation has fallen steadily since.

The story also discloses that as a result of pressure tactics by the Committee To Frame a World Constitution, 22 State legislatures adopted resolutions endorsing world government, but 14 have since rescinded the action.

The history of this committee and its publication, together with the actions of the various State legislatures in rescinding resolutions previously adopted, would seem to indicate that Mr. Cousins scarcely reflected the American public opinion accurately when he described world government as the "fastest growing movement in the United States."

In fact, it is perfectly plain from reading the clips that the Hindu newspapers sensed that Mr. Cousins did not know what he was talking about. A Bombay daily, the Hindustan, commented as follows:

It seems in this trip Mr. Cousins is going to appear more as a political expert than a man of letters. The topics of his talks deal mainly with "democracy," "peace," "American public opinion," and so on. It is a matter of regret that Bombay will not come to know about the artistic personality of a man who has been heading for 10 years a first-rank literary magazine like the Saturday Review of Literature.

Need I note that in his letter to me, Mr. Barrett six months later was still trying to palm off Mr. Cousins' selection because of his prominence in the American world of letters? And Mr. Barrett implied that Mr. Cousins was to talk about things considerably closer to the hearts of Americans than world government.

Among the other curious performances of Mr. Cousins was his statement in Ceylon rapping the United Nations which—if I understand American policy correctly—we support 100 percent, and a statement in Madras, India, denouncing "Red witch hunts" in the United States.

According to the Times of Ceylon, published in Colombo, January 19, Mr. Cousins advised Ceylon not to join the UN. Here is what that press clip says:

He further said that Ceylon was not a member of the UN and need not be as long as the (UN) organization had no effective means to suppress aggression.

I am sorry that I cannot quote any more from that clipping, but unfortunately, Mr. Cousins seldom rated more than three of four paragraphs in the newspapers, and I would scarcely call his trip a success so far as publicity is concerned.

Concerning his denunciation of what he called "Red witch hunts" in America, I want to read from a clipping from the newspaper, The Indian Express, dated January 20. I quote:

Giving his views on the Red hunt in America, Mr. Cousins said that there was a tremendous movement against this there, that even the Attorney General recently came before the American public denouncing the witch hunt. One could expect this problem to be really solved only when the problem of peace in the world was also solved.

It apparently has never occurred to Mr. Cousins that we will only have peace in the world when we get rid of communism and that we will only have security in the United States when we have driven the last Communist off the Government payroll and out of posts of influence.

I think the House is entitled to know the upshot of Mr. Cousins' trip so far as Mr. Cousins himself is concerned.

Mr. Cousins is a bright young man, and I do not expect anyone to criticize him too much for trying to make a fast dollar. Throughout his journey he was sending dispatches to the Saturday Review of Literature bearing such datelines as Tokyo, Korea, and so forth. Mr. Cousins afforded his readers his views on a wide variety of topics, including deprecating Congress for demanding the ouster of Dean Acheson, for cultivating totalitarian postures, for political headline hunting and crass exhibitionism," and for a variety of other things, including advocacy of Red witch hunts. I might add that about the nicest thing he said about Congress in one dispatch was that it had "crackpots" among its Members.

But Mr. Cousins really hit the jackpot when, under the sponsorship of the State Department, he got an interview with Nehru, the Prime Minister of India. This is the same Nehru who wants Red China admitted to the United Nations and who holds other torturous views once held by the late and lamented Jan Masaryk, of Czechoslovakia. Nehru evidently thinks that the way to get along with communism is to hold hands with the Communists in world organizations. Mr. Masaryk paid for similar beliefs with his life, and his country paid for his beliefs with its freedom.

I do not know whether Mr. Norman Cousins had a scoop or not in interviewing Nehru inasmuch as he does not seem very difficult to interview. But I think the House should know that the publishing firm of John Day Co. has just announced it is publishing Mr. Cousins' interview with Prime Minister Nehru in book form—at \$2 a copy. Lest some member be tempted to rush to the nearest bookstore and buy this book, I will warn him in advance that most of the questions asked by Mr. Cousins answered themselves and were as long as the answers supplied by Mr. Nehru. So the book comes out about equal parts Cousins and Nehru.

As a Member of this House, who, like many other members, dislikes to see the taxpayers' money go down the drain, and as one who is deeply distressed over the lack of favorable world opinion about American foreign policy, I would say that Mr. Barrett and the State Department have performed a great disservice to their country in fostering this Cousins trip. It appears to me that Mr. Cousins lined his pockets at the expense of Uncle Sam, and if this \$2 book has any sales at all, he promises to have further profits in addition to the free trip he has already taken.

Finally, it is my conclusion and my recommendation that the State Department and its Division of Public Affairs forget its program of dispatching rep-



representative citizens to other parts of the globe until such time as the State Department has been thoroughly cleaned out and the personnel replaced by individuals with considerable more judgment than that exercised by Mr. Barrett and Mr. Acheson. America has reached a low state indeed when it has to choose an obscure editor such as Norman Cousins to represent it in any part of the world.

I suppose in the final analysis that this Cousins case should be regarded for what it is—only another example of the complete ineptness and blundering of the bunch of bureaucrats, pinkos, and nincompoops who infest the agencies of our Government, particularly the State Department. The Cousins case is certainly an excellent example of how difficult it is for Congress to find out what is going on in the executive branch of this Government.

Mr. Cousins spent all his time promoting a world federation and belittling the United Nations. Is the State Department for or against the United Nations? It looks to me as if, following their usual practice, they were on both sides of that question and were trying to ride two horses at the same time.

I wonder how the taxpayers like that?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Do I understand that this propagandist, urging a world government, was paid for out of the Voice of America funds?

Mr. TABER. That is correct; \$4,552.50.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Who approved such an expenditure?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Barrett.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If Mr. Barrett has the money to throw away in that fashion, would it not be good common sense to take twenty or twenty-five million off of his authorization in this particular bill and make him a little more cautious about such procedures?

Mr. TABER. I think it would be a little more appropriate if that were done.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I must answer that question this way, and ask one. When we were getting out of Han Kiang about last Christmas time, I suppose you would like to have the fire power cut off? You stopped your fire power, and that is where the Reds are today.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman can get plenty of time to make a speech. I would have been glad to answer a question.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a moment.

At this time we are in this situation: We have had this so-called Voice of America putting out all sorts of things on the air, some of them absolutely flat and unable to draw the interest of people in foreign lands; some of them by people

who have endeavored to stir up trouble amongst the people of the United States, like that broadcast by Raymond Gram Swing, who went after General MacArthur. We all know what Raymond Gram Swing is. Frankly, during all of the time of the first months of the Korean debacle, when we went in there, there was not one word telling the world why the United States was right in its position. Frankly, if we are going to have a Voice of America, it should support the position of the people of the United States and it should represent them.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COLMER. There is one question in connection with what the gentleman has been discussing that has concerned me as a question of policy. What I cannot understand is that these departments apparently have money to pick up any man or group of men or any group of people and send them over to Europe on one mission or another. If Members of Congress want to go over to Europe on any mission, ordinarily they have to get approval of the Congress by proper resolution and proper appropriation. I am going to give the gentleman an illustration of what I am talking about. I want to say that I have no criticism of that mission. I think it was a splendid mission. Recently a group from this body was taken over by the military or the State Department, or both, I do not know which, flown over to Europe, and they did a good job over there. More recently a group from the other body went over under the same auspices and came back. I do not say that was a bad thing, but I am talking about the policy of the departments having the right to do that.

It was brought to my attention this morning—and I want to say in all fairness this is only hearsay, that the State Department is now planning to take people, men and their wives, and others, and send them over to Europe at Government expense to show those people over there a few of the people we have over here. That may be a good thing, but why does the Department have that much leeway when we are talking about trying to save money?

Mr. TABER. I frankly do not see. Frankly, the thing that bothers me is this: General MacArthur was fired because they say he said something that did not jibe with the policy of the administration. This man goes over and he tells these people that the United Nations does not meet the situation of the world, contrary to what I understand is the policy of the United States Government; he tells them that we should join a world federation, or a world government. I do not see where a paid propagandist from the State Department should go over and advocate a program which is not the United States policy, and I do not approve of that way of doing business; I cannot get myself down to that level.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The Voice of America is asking approximately \$100,000 in this bill. Can the gentleman tell the American people any tangible evidence of what the Voice of America has accomplished since it has been established?

Mr. TABER. The trouble is that they have not very often; there have been rare occasions when they did have something that was some good. But I have made it my business repeatedly and repeatedly to go over scripts of their broadcasts; I have read hundreds of them myself. The worst curse that goes with that is that everything they send me by way of a broadcast script they send likewise to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from New York tells me it is ruining his eyesight to have to read all of them. I am sorry about that; I did not want to bring that trouble on anybody.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say that at the expense of my deteriorating eyesight I do not interpret the scripts I read as does the gentleman from New York; I do not reach the conclusions the gentleman reaches after reading the scripts word by word, and the gentleman has caused me to read bales of them, thousands of them. Let him point out what is wrong with some of these scripts he has on the floor right now. Let us see in what respects they are wrong, incorrect, and not proper propaganda.

Mr. TABER. I have just a few minutes; I have not any of them in my hand, but there are several up at the table.

Mr. ROONEY. Why not include one in the Record?

Mr. TABER. That one on MacArthur is bad.

Mr. ROONEY. Why not insert that in the Record and let the people know what is going on.

Mr. TABER. If I were to put all of the bad ones in the Record there would be no room for other things for months to come.

Mr. ROONEY. I will settle on 10 out of the many thousands if the gentleman will put 10 in the Record. Let the people know what is going on and see what you are talking about.

Mr. TABER. There will probably be more than 10 referred to and pointed out by speakers here this afternoon.

Mr. DONDERO. What I asked for was tangible evidence of what the Voice of America has accomplished for this country after we have spent million of dollars in financing it. That is what I want to know.

Mr. TABER. We have not done what we should have done. If we had a set-up there which would find out what the psychology of the people they were going to broadcast to was and is, and have people in charge who are competent to do it, I believe there could be a real good come from it. It needs a first-class businessman to run it, it needs absolute loyalty, and not so many people.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the remarks just made by the gentleman from



New York, I should like to read the following letter from Assistant Secretary of State Edward W. Barrett:

JULY 19, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN ROONEY,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: In our conversation last Friday I mentioned that Representative TABER has asked for all reports dealing with the recent lecture tour of Mr. Norman Cousins in the Near and Far East. As you know, we have learned through past experience that one of the most effective means to counter Communist propaganda is through personal appearances by prominent Americans. Lecturing by Fulbright lecturers under P. L. 584 (Fulbright Act) and other leaders and specialists has proved increasingly effective.

As I told you, we have sent such people abroad before with emphasis on their lecturing both to specialized and to general audiences. I should clarify, however, that Mr. Cousins was the first to be sent abroad for the specific purpose of lecturing to general audiences with no emphasis on specialized groups. As a representative of an American intellectual publication and a long-time student of India, he seems to have done a good job. Loy Henderson was enthusiastic about the results.

In accordance with our conversation, I am enclosing for your information copies of letters, clippings and reports which we have sent to Mr. TABER.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD M. BARRETT.

P. S.—The business of sending lecturers abroad, plus many of our activities, appears not to be particularly new. Edward Boykin recently published an analysis of the propaganda campaign which Lincoln put on to win British support during the Civil War. After telling about Lincoln's distribution of 1,750,000 papers of pronorthern literature and sponsoring 150 pronorthern mass meetings in Great Britain, Boykin reports:

"Lincoln routed a cavalcade of American lecturers and stump speakers through Britain, men who could speak for the North at mass meetings of the British people. He summoned Henry Ward Beecher, America's most popular and powerful pulpiteer, to Washington, gave him instructions and hurried him to England.

Mr. Chairman, under the permission heretofore granted me by the House I shall insert in the RECORD at this point the copies of letters, clippings, and reports sent to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and referred to by Mr. Barrett, as well as a two-page typewritten sheet which contains material on the same subject. I do this without having read the clippings or any of this poorly photostated material. I do with the idea that the American people are entitled to hear the State Department side of this controversy and without any personal opinion on my part one way or the other.

The material referred to follows:

RECENT LECTURE TOUR OF MR. NORMAN COUSINS TO SOUTHEAST ASIA, UNDER THE DEPARTMENT'S EXCHANGE OF PERSONS PROGRAM, PUBLIC LAW 402

The Department of State conducts an international educational exchange program to authority contained in the Smith-Mundt Act, the Fulbright Act and the Finnish War Debt Act, under which American professors, research scholars, teachers, students, and leaders and specialists in various fields of endeavor are sent abroad and persons in these categories are brought to the United

States on grants-in-aid awarded by the Department, the over-all purposes being to promote American understanding and friendship among the peoples of other countries. The Department is, of course, constantly endeavoring to discover means by which the fullest possible realization of this objective can be achieved.

In furtherance of this aim, officers of the bureau concerned with South Asian affairs in the Department felt that in view of his prominence in the American world of letters, Mr. Norman Cousins, editor, the Saturday Review of Literature, would be the type of person who might be well suited to undertake a project of lecturing on the American way of life before foreign audiences, especially in certain areas where the United States is too little understood. It was believed that as a well-informed, successful private citizen he could articulate the United States position in world affairs, and could commend a sympathetic reaction to our point of view from influential groups which have been critical of our policies. The Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs and the Assistant Secretary for Near Eastern Affairs approved of the choice of Mr. Cousins and officers in the Office of Educational Exchange concurred. Concurrence was also obtained from the United States missions in India and Pakistan.

Mr. Cousins was accordingly awarded a Departmental grant under Public Law 402 to enable him to lecture on various aspects of American life at United States Information Centers and before other interested groups in Ceylon, India and Pakistan. In India, Mr. Cousins delivered lectures in Madras, Calcutta, New Delhi, and Bombay. In Pakistan, he addressed groups in Dacca, Lahore, and Karachi. He likewise visited Japan, Hong Kong, and Singapore, although these points were not included in his lecture assignment. Mr. Cousins' grant consisted of all necessary transportation, a salary compensation at the rate of \$500 per month, and a per diem in accordance with Standardized Government Travel Regulations, the stipulation being that the assignment was to be for a period not to exceed 75 days.

Reports from our missions covering Mr. Cousins' general lectureship have generally been gratifying and indicate that it served effectively to further the objectives of the Campaign of Truth. Apparently the only factor which marred the complete success of this project was the presence on Mr. Cousins' trip of a Mr. Julius Stulman, who, it is understood, is a personal friend of Mr. Cousins and accompanied him at the latter's request. Mr. Stulman, however, paid all of his own expenses and was not sponsored by the Department, although the Bureau of Near Eastern Affairs requested the missions in India and Pakistan to extend to him the customary courtesies in furthering his professional contacts with local groups. Reports from Bombay and Madras indicate that Mr. Stulman's constant presence with Mr. Cousins detracted somewhat from the effectiveness of Mr. Cousins' visit.

JANUARY 25, 1951.

From: Colombo, Ceylon.

To: The Department of State, Washington.  
Reference: Department's circular telegram 312, December 26, 1950.

Subject: Visit of Norman Cousins.

Mr. Norman Cousins, accompanied by Mr. Julius Stulman, arrived on schedule in Ceylon on January 14. During his 3-day stay he spoke twice in Colombo and twice in Jaffna, at the northern tip of Ceylon. In Colombo he addressed audiences at the YMCA and at the University of Ceylon. In Jaffna he spoke in Jaffna city under the auspices of the Jaffna District Community Centers and at Jaffna College.

The subjects announced in Department's telegram 312, December 26, 1950, were unfamiliar to Mr. Cousins, who had not seen the instruction. He spoke principally about the world crisis and the solution offered by the United World Federalists. One speech in Jaffna he devoted to the Connecticut experiment in education. The PAO suggested that he list the titles he intended to use in future talks, to be sent to other posts on his route. The new titles are "Where the Peace Begins," "Don't Resign From the Human Race," "The American Laboratory for Education."

Mr. Cousins made an excellent impression here as a sincere, intense person with an idealist's hope for world peace through federal union. His platform presence is friendly and conversational, and his approach to the dream of world government is honest and persuasive, though lacking in definiteness. His handling of audience questions was admirable.

The visit of so attractive a person as Mr. Cousins, representing the finest type of thoughtful, keen-witted, sensitive young American, has done much good here.

Press clippings reporting his talks are enclosed.

ANGUS TRESIDDER,  
Public Affairs Officer

(For the Chargé d'Affaires, ad interim).

[From the Times of Ceylon, Colombo, Ceylon,  
January 15, 1951]

NORMAN COUSINS TALK TODAY

Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the American literary journal Saturday Review of Literature, arrived at Katunayake Airport yesterday by BOAC plane. He will deliver a lecture on Conditions of Democracy in the Modern World at the YMCA this evening.

[From the Colombo (Ceylon) Observer of  
January 16, 1951]

"WORLD GOVERNMENT DESPERATELY  
NECESSARY"

"I believe it is desperately necessary to have a world-wide government in which nations could maintain their own institutions, accepting a high sovereignty in matters concerned with the security of the people," said Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature, in the course of a lecture he delivered yesterday in the YMCA forum.

He said:

"Today the nations of the world are in the same position as they were as far back as the fourth century B. C. Their intention is to find a system of world government so that people can live peacefully. But instead, we have a League of Nations type or organization, where the veto, a weapon which can be used by any nation to hinder world progress, has been proposed and passed."

Mr. Cousins continued:

"We have had wars almost continually for the last 300 years. It is not possible for a Russia and an America, a Communist and a democratic state to exist at the same time.

"I believe that it is desperately necessary to have a world-wide government, in which nations could maintain their own institutions, accepting a high sovereignty in matters concerned with the security of the people. The World Federal Government is the fastest growing movement in the United States. But although the proposal could come from the United States it would be no use without support from Asian countries. The future of the world depends on the partnership between Asia and the United States of America.

"LAST CHANCE

"Would Russia accept? No one knows. But this is the last chance and India,



Pakistan, Ceylon and the United States could make the proposal in good faith to the world, in an honest attempt to avert war.

"Any country acting in good faith would have every reason to accept. If Russia does not accept, we should not despair. The door must be kept open at all times. There should be no spirit of defeatism or fatalism."

Before the commencement of the lecture, Mr. E. W. Kannangara introduced the speaker to the audience.

Mr. H. A. J. Hulugalle also spoke.

[From the Times of Ceylon, Colombo, Ceylon, of January 19, 1951]

#### CEYLON NEED NOT JOIN UNO

VADUKODDAI, Wednesday.—"We all want peace and the greatest opportunity awaits the East to lead the world out of disorder into peace" said Mr. Norman Cousins, editor, Saturday Review, addressing a packed audience of teachers and students at Jaffna College. The Reverend S. K. Bunker, principal, Jaffna College, presided.

What the UNO had tried to do was to cope with aggressive elements rather than suppress them early and prevent war.

He then described the great atrocities perpetrated in Korean battlefields and the feeling of disillusionment prevalent among the Koreans. He asserted that there was yet hope that the UNO might work in the direction of a world federation recognizing the sovereignty of suffering humanity and create conditions suitable to peace.

He further said that Ceylon was not a member of the UNO and need not be as long as the organization had no effective means to suppress aggression.

#### ANOTHER LECTURE

JAFFNA, Thursday.—Mr. Norman Cousins delivered a public address at the Jaffna Central College Hall on citizens and education in America.

Mudaliyar C. Thiagarajah, president of the Jaffna District Community Centers Union, presided.

[From the Times of Ceylon, Colombo, Ceylon, of January 19, 1951]

#### RHYMES OF THE TIMES—WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

"The world federal government is the fastest growing movement in the United States. I believe it is desperately necessary to have a world-wide government" (Mr. Norman Cousins in Ceylon).

The world's contracting into a billiard ball,  
America's in the middle of Ceylon;  
A world federal movement will save us all.

Southeast Asia is in the Mall,  
And wicked, gay Paree at the Golden Faun;  
The world's contracting into a billiard ball.

The Colombo diplomat is Mayfair's jewel,  
America's darling, Miss Anna Wong;  
A world federal movement will save us all.

The English hunt gave us our annual kraal,  
And Carol Reed made the quiet place a kam-  
pong;

The world's contracting into a billiard ball.

So, Mr. Cousins, God speed towards your goal,  
Send us some federated 'taters, tractors,  
corn;

A world federal movement will save us all.

Send us federated Grable for Beira Ball,  
Marx brothers to play my role, when I am  
gone;

The world's contracting into a billiard ball;  
A world federation movement will save us all.  
T.

[From the Times of Ceylon, Colombo, Ceylon, of January 18, 1951]

#### UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IS FOR PEACE, SAYS NORMAN COUSINS

"I do not know how close we are to another war. I do not know how much time we have to avert another war. But I know we are not doing enough to avert war", said Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, during a public lecture at King George's Hall yesterday evening.

Sir Ivor Jennings, Vice-Chancellor, University of Ceylon, presided.

Mr. Cousins, speaking on public opinion in the United States, as reflected in their peace movements, said that few voices seemed to be raised for peace, and many for war. He did not think newspapers and magazines in the United States reflected the true public opinion. Their main aim was to convince Russia, and they meant business. But, he believed, the American Government sincerely wanted peace.

Mr. Cousins said there was a growing movement in the United States which said that world law was the only way of attaining peace. The people of the United States believe the crisis that faced the world was a human crisis, not a national one.

[From the Colombo (Ceylon) Daily News of January 16, 1951]

#### NEED FOR WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT STRESSED—"FASTEST GROWING MOVEMENT IN UNITED STATES"

"Today the nations of the world are in the same position as they were as far back as the fourth century, B. C. Their intention is to find a system of world government so that people can live peacefully. But instead, we have a League of Nations type of organization where the vote, a weapon which can be used by any nation to hinder world progress, has been proposed and passed."

This view was expressed by Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature, in a lecture yesterday in the Y. M. C. A. forum in which he advocated the forming of a world federal government.

"The League of Nations could have prevented war by stopping Japan in 1932, and again by checking the Germans on the Rhine in 1934. Two giant powers with a vacuum existing between can only mean that each will be trying to prevent the vacuum from being filled by the other."

"We have had wars almost continually for the last 300 years. It is not possible for a Russia and an America, a Communist and a democratic state to exist at the same time."

#### DESPERATELY NECESSARY

"I believe that it is desperately necessary to have a world-wide government, in which nations could maintain their own institutions, accepting a high sovereignty in matters concerned with the security of the people. The world federal government is the fastest growing movement in the United States. But although the proposal could come from the United States it would be of no use without support from Asian countries. The future of the world depends on the partnership between Asia and the United States of America."

"Would Russia accept? No one knows. But this is the last chance and India, Pakistan, Ceylon, and the United States could make the proposal in good faith to the world, in an honest attempt to avert war."

#### "DOOR MUST BE KEPT OPEN

"Any country acting in good faith would have every reason to accept. If Russia does not accept, we should not despair. The door

must be kept open at all times. There should be no spirit of defeatism or fatalism."

"Some say that this talk of world government is being visionary. But what have practical men brought on but three practical wars."

Mr. Cousins pointed out that he was not speaking for the majority of the American people. "The majority," he said, "had not yet accepted. In my State a 4 months discussion campaign on the subject ended with a signed petition being submitted to the President of the United States, requesting him to take the initiative to bring about world peace."

"I believe," he added, "that the peoples of India, Pakistan, and Ceylon can join this movement. There is a starvation of moral leadership. If there is a volcanic eruption of moral force somewhere in the world, then moral peace will prevail."

Before the commencement of the lecture, Mr. E. W. Kannangara introduced the speakers to the audience and observed that "at a time when war is threatened and the democratic way of life is challenged, we are fortunate to have Mr. Norman Cousins to speak."

Mr. H. A. J. Hulugalle also spoke.

APRIL 24, 1951.

From: AMCONSUL, Bombay, India.

To: The Department of State, Washington.  
Reference: Bombay's Dispatch No. 885 dated April 4, 1951.

Subject: Norman Cousins' interview with Pandit Nehru.

The Sunday edition of the Bharat Jyoti, for April 22, devoted the enclosed two pages of space to the tape-recorded interview of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru accomplished by Norman Cousins during the last few days he was in India. The fact that a major Bombay Sunday paper would devote this much space to the interview is additional evidence of the impact that Norman Cousins had locally. This Consulate General would again like to report its satisfaction with the visit of this particular American leader specialist.

PRESCOTT CHILDS,  
American Consul General.

(Enclosure: Clipping, Bharat Jyoti, April 22, 1951.)

[From the Bharat Jyoti, of April 22, 1951]

A WORLD FREE FROM FEAR—NEHRU DISPELS UNITED STATES SUSPICIONS: TALK WITH NORMAN COUSINS—OUTSPOKEN ANSWERS TO CRITICAL QUESTIONS ON INDIA—MANY FALLACIES ARE EXPOSED: VALUES THAT INDIA PRIZES

(Mr. Norman Cousins was sent out to India by the United States Government to speak to us about the purposes and policies which motivated America. The American people are concerned because they feel that India is gradually drifting away from their bloc. The present-day world tension has created a complex of fear. Fear has driven them into imagining that there can be no other right policy than one they follow. It therefore leads them to the conclusion that those who are not with them are against them. India's foreign policy has therefore come under an angry criticism and irritation. India prefers to consider her own national interests first, which demand that a temper of peace is necessary before we can apply ourselves to the problems which the world faces. India feels that we must also realize that means are as important as the ends. Evil cannot be met by evil. Unfortunately, however, India's independent policy is considered by many in the United States, according to Mr. Cousins, as deliberately leading toward totalitarianism of the left or preparations for a full partnership with



united Communist Asia. Such an estimate of our approach has upset the otherwise friendly feelings between the two countries. In the heat, words fly and ignorant charges are made against much that India stands for. Even Mr. Norman Cousins did not escape from its gloomy touch. Though he pleads for better understanding and seeks to understand the Indian point of view from Prime Minister Nehru in this long interview, he refers to petty things which, according to him, indicated the hostility of the Indian public to the United States. He cites the playing up of race stories from the United States in our newspapers. He does not realize that Asia sees in race riots the evidence of double standards which the west still continues to believe in. This interview is a recorded conversation between Mr. Nehru and Mr. Cousins. It is perhaps one of the finest expositions of the mind of the Prime Minister and throws light on many things. Mr. Cousins, however, remains unconvinced. He makes an eloquent plea in his summing up to the American people as follows: "It is important that we consider carefully Mr. Nehru's responses, for a wise American policy with respect to India may help to save what remains of Asia and to a large extent may help to save the peace of the world itself. I believe I am justified in saying that there could be no more tragic mistake for America than to write off India as a Soviet satellite. My own guess is that the Nehru government is actually much further from the extreme left than the people themselves, or at least from the small section of the people that is politically conscious and articulate. If America, with full sense of India's importance and with human values at the core of our foreign policy, proposes a working partnership with India, the results quite conceivably might be one of the turning points of history.")

#### SO THE WORLD MAY KNOW

"Mr. COUSINS. I have been increasingly disturbed in the past few weeks at what seemed to be a growing misunderstanding between India and the United States. Reading the press of India and also reading clippings from newspapers in the United States, which people back home have sent along to me, I have become deeply concerned that these two people, who have so much to offer each other and, indeed, upon whom the burden of world peace rests, should today be drifting apart. How do you account for this growing misunderstanding which, in many instances, seems actually to approach hostility.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. You have been here now some weeks or months. I should like to think of your own experiences here. Have you in your individual capacity experienced—shall I say—any hostility toward you yourself or toward Americans as individuals?

"Mr. COUSINS. Here in India I have had one of the richest experiences in my life. I feel, and I say it in all sincerity, that I have been made to feel as much at home by the Indian people as I am back in the United States. Yet"—

Yes; it is this "yet" that is at the bottom of all the misunderstanding between India and America. The interview that the editor of the Saturday Review of Literature had with the Prime Minister of India is conditioned by this "yet." The interview is reproduced here as it has been recorded. We offer no apology for its inordinate length, as the subject discussed by the two distinguished persons is of extreme importance and the world must know what we in India stand for. Here is the text:

"Mr. COUSINS. I wonder whether you would care to define for Americans the basis of Indian and American understanding and friendship today.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well, I don't know that it is possible to define anything pre-

cisely in the modern world. The most one can do is to grope about and try to see a way toward any kind of objective that one aims at. Basically, I feel that it is of essential importance for India and the United States to understand and then possibly appreciate each other's outlook with a view to as large a measure of cooperation as possible. Having said that, I begin to think what our more ultimate objectives involving a large part of Asia today and possibly the rest of the world. But for the moment I am speaking about India.

"We are—well, in search of our soul. We are groping and trying some kind of adjustment—integration, if you like—of our national life, our international as well as individual lives.

"Having passed through these periods of transition and very rapid change, we have to find some equilibrium. Normally this would have been difficult enough; but in the present state of affairs, after all that occurred since the war in India—the partition, independence, and so on—all this has shaken us up a good deal. And so we are trying to search to find out what our objectives are. Some of us may have some vague notions; others try to look at things objectively without any fixed ideas so far as possible. So when any—shall I say slogans or fixed concepts—are put, we use them in a measure, but we are rather suspicious, too, because slogans are apt to petrify a man's thinking.

"Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Prime Minister, exactly what slogans and fixed concepts do you have in mind?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Every slogan, every word, almost, that is used by the Socialist, the Communist, the capitalist. People hardly think nowadays. They throw words at each other. They talk about democracy, but when we sit down and think about democracy all kinds of aspects of it appear which do not necessarily come up in the average man's mind. An Englishman may think of democracy in terms of his system; an American in terms of his system. Russia talks about the people's democracy, which is completely different. They use the same word. People talk about equality. Equality has a certain meaning in people's minds—in Western Europe, in America—a certain meaning which is very largely political. And certainly something aiming at economic equality.

"Mr. COUSINS. For purposes of this discussion, Mr. Prime Minister, how would you define democracy in order to give it a universal meaning—something that people everywhere could understand and respond to?"

#### THE DEMOCRATIC WAY OF LIFE

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Now, I told you just now that definitions are very difficult, and I do not presume to define anything, because to define anything that is big is to limit it.

"Nevertheless, if I may vaguely suggest something, I would say that democracy is not only political, not only economic, but something of the mind, as everything is ultimately something of the mind. It involves equality of opportunity to all people, as far as possible, in the political and economic domain. It involves the freedom of the individual to grow and to make the best of his capacities and ability. It involves a certain tolerance of others and even of others' opinions when they differ from yours. It involves a certain contemplative tendency and a certain inquisitive search for truth—and for, let us say, the right thing.

"That is, it is a dynamic, not a static, thing, and as it changes it may be that its domain will become wider and wider. Ultimately, it is a mental approach applied to our political and economic problems.

"Mr. COUSINS. In terms of the basic equalities inherent in democracy that you men-

tion, Mr. Prime Minister—not only political equality but social equality and economic equality—would you agree that political equality is the means through which people may achieve the other equalities? For if we lack political equality then we lack the main tools by which we can secure for ourselves the other rights. Take, for example, the right of protest, which is at the heart of political democracy. I am sure you would agree that if the right of protest is destroyed no country can really call itself a democracy. Nor can any people expect to have other forms of equality—economic or social—unless they maintain this right of protest.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Yes, political freedom or political equality is the very basis on which you build up other equalities. At the same time political equality may cease to have meaning if there is gross economic inequality. Where, let us say, people are starving the vote does not count. They are thinking in terms of the next meal and not of the vote. But leaving that out for the moment, political equality is the basis for other equalities.

"Mr. COUSINS. Would you say, Mr. Prime Minister, that it would then also follow that the state must submit itself regularly to the approval of the people? Because unless a people have the chance to pass upon the merits of a certain government political equality will be meaningless.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. I agree again. Although I accept that principle completely, in practice the people can be preyed upon so much by propaganda by rousing their passions in this or that direction that you may get some entirely wrong decisions and wrong policies. But you must take this risk. It is far better to take this risk than the other risk.

"Mr. COUSINS. I suppose one thing that democracy, as you have defined it, does do is to protect the individual against dangerous error by government. It is true that in the course of sustaining free institutions many mistakes will be made, just as there will be many abuses—abuses which at times, I suppose, will complicate the operation of a democracy. And yet if the mistakes and the abuses become too large, the people can use their ultimate power to protect themselves and, as we say in America, to turn the rascals out. What other hope is there that, despite the abuses and the confusions, the people can keep decisions in their own hands, which means that the individual must be protected in his right to change the state?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. The individual has to be protected. Also the social organism has to be protected against the predatory individual. You take steps against the gangster or the antisocial individual. So the process of protection is twofold. And it is just possible—in fact not only possible but it has taken place innumerable times—that a group may gain power and may manage for some time, at least, to preserve that power not merely by the physical means of guns but by deluding the public by propaganda or by other processes.

"Mr. COUSINS. In which case you might then also say that the people themselves have failed rather than democracy itself?

"Wouldn't you agree that democracy is actually a chance—a chance for the individual, a chance to develop his own potentialities, a chance to grow, a chance to advance the human procession, perhaps, even, a chance to justify his own place in self-government?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. There is an old saying, isn't there, that the people get the government they deserve? And the kind of democracy they deserve? Democracy requires obviously a higher standard among far more people than other forms of government. If they do not reach their standard it may be that their democratic apparatus may fail.



"Mr. COUSINS. A moment ago you discussed the relationship of men to the state. From what you said I gather that you believe deeply that the state is made for man and not man for the state. The individual, of course, does have obligations and responsibilities to society at large, but the state basically is created to advance the welfare of the individual?"

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Undoubtedly. The individual is uppermost in my mind; but in a social organism an individual cannot be separated from the rest. The rights of the individual must be balanced by the obligations of the individual to the social organism. Without obligations there can be no real rights.

"Mr. COUSINS. Well, suppose we begin then by defining—I apologize again for getting into definitions—suppose we begin by defining what the principal obligations of the state are to the individual. After that suppose we go on to the obligations of the individual toward society as a whole.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. This business of definition rather embarrasses me, because I am not a professor or a philosopher or even a very effective politician. I have dabbled in various things and given a great deal of thought to matters, because they interest me. A state's obligations to the individual or the individual's obligations to the state must necessarily have varied during different periods of history. The original state was a very, very simple state in which, practically speaking, all that the state had to do was to protect the individual from a foreign enemy or another tribe. Then, from that develops the concept of what might be called, without being offensive, a police state. A state preserves law and order, protects its citizens from foreign enemies, and takes taxes to carry on its business. For the rest, it was left to the individual or the group. The present idea of the state has grown far beyond that. A state is supposed to do much more. Every state—I am not talking about any particular brand of state—every state is trying to do ever so much more for the individual than has ever been attempted previously.

"So the state becomes more and more of a socially functioning organism—for the good of society or the individual, as you like. And the more it becomes that, the more benefits it confers on the individual, the more, in a sense, the individual has obligations to that state. So the two things, the rights and the obligations, march together.

"If the state and individual are properly integrated and organized, there is no conflict. Otherwise, if one side goes ahead of the other, there is a lack of balance.

"Mr. COUSINS. Within that general framework what would you say an individual has the right to expect of a state—not only as a matter of protection against a foreign power, but in his direct dealings with the state itself? How would you illustrate the socially functioning organism you just mentioned?"

#### EXPERIMENTAL, NOT DOGMATIC

"Prime Minister NEHRU. The state, apart from protecting the individual from foreign enemies or internal disorders, has the duty to undertake to provide him with opportunities of progress, of education, health, sanitation—generally, everything that would give him the opportunity to fit himself for such work as he is capable of doing. And, you see, the state, as everything else today, has grown more and more centralized. The deep problem of today, to put it in this way, is this: you cannot escape centralized authority, whether it is of the state, whether it is of the big corporation, whether it is of the trade union, or whether it is of any group. They all go on being centralized authorities. Now all centralization is a slight encroachment on the freedom of the individual. We want to preserve the freedom of the individ-

ual, and at the same time we cannot escape centralization in modern society. How to balance the two?

"Mr. COUSINS. Would it be fair to ask you to answer your own question? What is the answer to the conflict between centralization and individual freedom?"

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well, I should say that we cannot do without a large measure of centralization. But we should try to limit that as far as possible, keeping the minimum of centralization and as far as possible decentralize the rest.

"Mr. COUSINS. Would you at this point, Mr. Prime Minister, care to discuss your own program for India today, in the light of these objectives?"

"Prime Minister NEHRU. I would hardly discuss that program in any detail but the general idea is that we—the state, that is—try to function in a way, first of all, to provide for the primary needs of our people or, at any rate, to make such arrangements that people can get those primary needs. Then there are the important secondary needs. Now, the economic organization would have to be rather a flexible one, so that we can vary by experience. It is inevitable that in India, where private resources are not great, any project must be a state project. Our river valley schemes must be state schemes. No one else can do them. And any other really big project can either be a state project or jointly owned by the state and private enterprise with a measure of state control, leaving a large field for a private enterprise. Thus we get what I would call a public sector of our economy and a private sector and maybe a sector where the two overlap, with part state control and largely a private sector managing under state control. So we have these three branches of our economy. There need not be any rigid lines between them, and we can see which functions better and more successfully and allow them to develop. Our approach is experimental and not dogmatic."

#### LAND REFORM IS FIRST ON LIST

"Mr. COUSINS. You said a moment ago, Mr. Prime Minister, that as a state increases its centralization in certain sections of the nation's economy it becomes all the more important to safeguard and increase the rights of the individual. Would you care to discuss India's position on that matter today—what India is doing today to safeguard and enlarge the rights of the people at a time when it is imperative for India to develop projects requiring centralization?"

"Prime Minister NEHRU. So far as political rights are concerned I suppose that our constitution has gone as far as any constitution can go toward safeguarding the political rights of the individual. So far as economic questions are concerned it is a question of a state interfering to protect, rather than keeping away, because in rather undeveloped economies there is a tendency to certain groups of vested interests to override the interests of the large groups by whatever methods they have. Now we are very largely speaking, an agricultural agrarian country. And one of our first programs is land reform; that is, to change the old big landlord system here—rather semifeudal landlord system—in favor here and there of cooperative farms, which we wish to encourage. That removes one out-of-date system—the big landlord system—which came in the way of our growth. The change-over has been complicated because we have done it by constitutional means and by giving compensation, which is a heavy burden. Nevertheless, that is clearing the way for other reforms—plans for industrial growth, agricultural growth—in many ways collaborating the two as far as possible and thus bringing about some kind of a balance between industry and agriculture today. There are far too many people on the land. We have to draw

some of them into industry—big industry or small industry or both.

"Mr. COUSINS. In connection with India's projected industrial development, is there anything that you believe the United States might be able to contribute to India's need today or in the near future?"

"Prime Minister NEHRU. It is obvious that a highly industrialized and technically efficient nation like the United States can give the greatest help to any underdeveloped country like India. After all, industrialization is limited, as it must be by various factors. There is the factor of the resources we can apply to it, which ultimately means, let us say, annual savings to be put into future growth. It also depends on the technical personnel that we can train. Perhaps that is an even more important factor. And so our progress is bound to be regulated by the resources at our disposal. If we have greater resources—technical, financial, or other—our progress will be faster. That we realize. At the same time, that real progress cannot be superimposed—it has to grow in the country, carrying the people with it. It is not teaching somebody at the top or just putting up a machine. We must grow up to it. While we want to grow fast, we want that progress to be solid and not just showy and superficial.

"The United States can help us in terms of capital goods and technical personnel. After all, in the nineteenth century a good deal of the development of both North and South America took place with help from Europe. That process to some extent can be applied to Asia now. That type of help can come which will develop Asia and which will enable her to solve her own problems.

"Mr. COUSINS. This brings up a question we discussed at the outset of our meeting today, Mr. Prime Minister. I refer to American-Indian relations. I have been increasingly disturbed in the past few weeks at what seemed to be a growing misunderstanding between India and the United States. Reading the press of India and also reading clippings from newspapers in the United States, which people back home have sent along to me, I have become deeply concerned that these two people, who have so much to offer each other and, indeed, upon whom the burden of world peace rests, should today be drifting apart. How do you account for this growing misunderstanding, which in many instances seems actually to approach hostility?"

"Prime Minister NEHRU. You have been here now some weeks or month. There are many Americans who have visited India during the last few months and have met all kinds of people—members of government, our officials, our people in the fields and factories, peasants, and the rest. I should like to think of your own experiences here. Have you in your individual capacity experienced—shall I say—any hostility toward you yourself or toward Americans as individuals?"

#### THE AMERICAN IS DISTURBED

"Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Prime Minister, here in India I have had one of the richest experiences in my life. I feel, and I say it in all sincerity, that I have been made to feel as much at home by the Indian people as I am back in the United States. Nowhere in the world outside America have I known such warm friendship. Yet at the same time I have observed, especially during the question period following my talks, in the comments that came at me from the audiences, and in reading some of the newspapers, I have observed misunderstanding about the United States that can result in hostility. I know this—that if I were a citizen of India and read the newspapers here and if my impressions of the United States were derived mainly from those newspapers I am afraid I would have a rather distorted idea of the



United States. I know that I might then be increasingly vulnerable if someone came at me with propaganda against the United States, I might feel that what he said would be correct, because I would have been conditioned in that direction. So I would say, based upon my experience, Mr. Prime Minister, that while I have nothing but the warmest feeling for the Indian people who have offered their hand in friendship wherever I have gone, I am, as an American, disturbed at what I have read in the press and what I have heard about America and the American people as a whole.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. I asked you that rather personal question because I wanted you to appreciate a certain difference between what might be called personal reactions and reactions in regard to some vague impersonal policy.

"Mr. COUSINS. Yes.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Now, look at our history vis-à-vis England. For 150 years or more there was a great deal of hostility, as was natural, against the British occupation of India. To some extent that was transferred to the Englishmen or the English officers here, too. But—not too much. Now, after this change in India to independence, you have no doubt found that there is very little hostility—practically none—to England and certainly none to any individual English man.

"Mr. COUSINS. That is reassuring, especially since I have felt at times here in India as though Americans were being held accountable for all the colonial and imperialistic abuses of the English during the period of their rule. Is it wrong to say that America may have replaced Great Britain as a villain in the eyes of some Indians, at least? Is that a fair statement?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well, I don't think so. Not in that sense, because the Englishman came in contact as an officer with the masses of our people. America is something distant about which our newspaper readers may read and talk. It does not sink to the level of the large masses. But what I was pointing out was this: That one must differentiate between what might be called the basic feeling of difference in outlook or policy, which for the moment may be expressed strongly but which does not represent any basic hostility. So far as India is concerned I do not think we are very good at long-continued or sustained hostility."

#### OUTLOOK AND APPROACH

"Apart from that (for at least 30 years or more we have been conditioned by Mahatma Gandhi. He was continuously telling us that we were fighting against British imperialism, but that we must treat the Englishman as our brother. Well, we did not learn this lesson very well, perhaps, but it did affect our minds and ways of thinking. Anyway, the whole point is this—that I do not think there is any basic hostility against America, or, for that matter, against any country here in India. Certain things, certain policies, which may not be clear or which may not fit into our policy, may create criticism—which is a completely different thing.

"Now our policy, I should like you to remember, our present general world policy is the natural outgrowth of all our thinking during the last 30 years or more. If you took the trouble to read the resolution our National Congress passed—25 years ago, 30 years ago—you would find a certain way of thinking which we repeated again and again. So that it was quite natural for us to carry that on—varying it, of course, adapting it to changing conditions in the world. Then came our independence. Again, the reaction of a newly independent country is not to get entangled; to keep going itself; to protect its own interest in terms of its larger friendship in the world. So that we had all this

background. Not that we are ignorant of world conditions; we are friendly observers of them. Then again, there is this aspect of it; if you dislike a thing or disapprove of it, how are you to meet that particular contingency now? We have felt all along that the right approach must be as far as possible an approach of friendliness even to the other wrong approach. Not appeasement. We make distinction between the two. One must not appease evil, but we have to convert evil as far as possible. Therefore we have to be firm and yet courteous and friendly. The evildoer may not be converted, but remember there are vast numbers of people who are not evil but are conditioned by the evildoer.

"Mr. COUSINS. I cannot, of course, speak for the American Government and I certainly cannot presume to speak for the American people. But I would guess that the American people would thoroughly agree with you in what you have said about appeasement. In our own relations with the rest of the world today we do feel that we are confronted with a matter of principle which it is difficult to put aside or ignore. We believe these principles are related not only to American security but to the security of free people of the world today, for the two are interdependent. We cannot advance common security for the world's peoples through a policy of appeasement. Would you agree?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. I agree with you entirely when you say that there should be no appeasement of evil. Having said that, it depends how you deal with evil. It depends also what is evil and what is not and to what degree a thing is evil. Very few things are 100 percent evil—just as very few things are 100 percent good—and if condemning something which is mixed good and evil you condemn the whole thing you might get slightly entangled in condemning the good, too.

"Mr. COUSINS. But what happens when you are threatened by the whole thing?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well when you are threatened by the whole thing you resist that threat, but you try to distinguish nevertheless, because otherwise you confuse people's minds and make them think that you are against the good, too.

"Mr. COUSINS. So far as the need to distinguish between the whole thing and its parts is concerned I believe that we in America do try to make distinctions. We do make a distinction I think, for example, between the Russian people and the Russian Government. I don't think there is any hostility in the United States toward the Russian people. We regard the Russian people as human beings who are entitled to the same fair share of the good things of life as we want for ourselves. But some peoples in the world today are harnessed by their governments to purposes which threatens the peace. Under these circumstances would you agree that even if we do make distinctions the threat to world peace can continue? How are we to deal with this threat—again, without uncertainty or appeasement?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well, that is a big question that you have raised. I should have said that the basic threat today in the world was fear. And fear is the most dangerous companion for any individual or for any country to possess. Fear clogs the mind, and fear leads often to impassioned action. As you have said, we must not give in to evil, but we must also remember that evil is not surmounted by wrong methods which themselves produce more evil. Therefore, the method becomes very important. It may sound—well, shall I say—like preaching a sermon. I have felt more and more that the basic lesson that Gandhi taught was right, and that was that means should never be subordinate to ends. I know that these sayings cannot easily be translated into life. A politician or statesman cannot function

like a prophet, whether it is in a democracy or any other type of government. He has to limit himself to people's understanding of him and people's appreciation of what he says, otherwise he cannot function at all. Nevertheless, this basic idea seems to be most important: that the right means should be employed and firmness should be allied always to a spirit of friendliness and conciliation, not of appeasement. I do make a distinction

"Mr. COUSINS. What, then, is a policy that could represent firmness without appeasement? What can we do to keep from spreading in the world that very doctrine—that the end justifies the means?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well, negatively speaking, the first thing to do is to follow means which can be justified. And not to adopt the same argument that in order to meet evil one can adopt any means to meet that evil. Then one stands on a stronger moral foundation and can meet that evil much more effectively. For the rest, it is a question of balance all the time—that in the context of things one at least does not do the wrong thing. Then, again, one thing is always possible—it is that one can be firm, shall I say, courteous, when need for firmness is not shown by violent language, which really, especially when countries are dealing with each other inflames popular passions so much that it becomes impossible to think calmly and dispassionately. Violent language inflames the minds of others—not only of the evil people but even of the good people, even of the good people on the other side. There is a wall created which absolutely prohibits understanding.

"Mr. COUSINS. As you observe the development of the United Nations, Mr. Prime Minister, do you believe that it does offer the means of creating an atmosphere of reason and checking the spread of such doctrines in the world—the doctrine, in particular, that the end justifies the means? In asking that, I suppose I am also asking how we can check and combat aggressive totalitarianism. Isn't this the primary job of the United Nations?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. The United Nations was formed with an objective defined in its charter. Its structure was both defined and proclaimed by its founders. It is essentially an instrument for peace. If that structure is changed and if it becomes an instrument for war then it does not function as United Nations but as something else which may really not be necessary; but it is a different functioning and different structure. The whole idea of the United Nations, in the minds of President Roosevelt and others, was that people in countries of different ways should come together around the table, that, in fact, every country in the world should come there and hammer out solutions instead of fighting on the battlefields. Now, if that structure is changed and a good part of the world is not there, then a very different situation is created; that other part of the world doesn't participate in that hammering out and it has to be dealt with by other means. The United Nations at the present moment is the only organization which can deal with such problems. But it does seem that its effectiveness is growing less. Its basic, I should say its spiritual, effectiveness is growing less because it is working in a field which is rather foreign in its conception.

"Mr. COUSINS. Yet isn't it possible that the existing structure of the United Nations is such as to make it difficult for all the nation of the world to sit around the same table? If one nation can set aside the will of the others through the veto, for example, then there is not much inducement to sit around a table for the purpose of coping with fairly fundamental problems. Then too, so long as there are no obligations that are compulsory and binding, which could



make it possible for the United Nations to implement and enforce its decisions, there is every tendency for nations which feel insecure to strengthen themselves through armament programs or military alliances."

#### UNITED NATIONS AND POWERS

"This in turn makes it difficult for one bloc to see the other bloc attempt to build up its position. Much attention has been paid to the refusal of the west to admit China. Yet Russia has consistently opposed the admission of Ceylon, which is certainly a representative government.

"Russia takes the view, no doubt, that to admit Ceylon would add strength to the opposing side. For perhaps some of the same reasons and a great many others the West feels justified in opposing the entry of China. Isn't there some way of resolving the problem by making the United Nations stronger than any possible combination within it? In such a United Nations, built upon clearly defined rights and obligations, might we not have the basis for the universal design you seek?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Doesn't that mean a change in the basic conception and structure of the United Nations, leading up to a United Nations which presents, by and large, countries of one way of thinking?

"Mr. COUSINS. The original conception of the United Nations, of course, is still the ideal. That is to say, an organization which can make the world safe for its differences. Any United Nations which would attempt to steamroller differences out of existence would—inevitably, I believe—result in war. But if, on the other hand, Mr. Prime Minister, the United Nations could be given adequate power, protecting the world against the violator rather than attempting to cope with aggression after aggression occurred, then we may be able to raise the United Nations to a plane where world peace does seem within sight. I suppose the big question for such a strengthened United Nations is not which nations are to be left out but how to get all the nations in the world to come in.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Surely the United Nations cannot claim two things at the same time. One is to ignore a country within its counsels and at the same time try to impose its will on that country which has been ignored. The two are contradictory. The United Nations, by keeping out some countries, whether China or Ceylon (both, I think, are equally wrong), in a sense denies itself the moral right to deal with that country. For that country it is a simple reply that 'you do not recognize us for this purpose; therefore, we have nothing to do with you.' The United Nations puts itself in a wrong position thereby. If you cannot deal with a country within the form of the United Nations, then the only alternative is to deal with it outside ultimately by force of arms."

#### WHAT HOPE FOR THE WORLD?

"When you talk about blocs, it is rather difficult to define what a bloc is. Any military alliance is a very close bloc. Any two or three or four countries joining together is a bloc—whether for military or other reasons. So either on the one side you must put an end to any association of two countries for any purpose—other than maybe cultural—or some kind of alliances will take place ultimately. Such things have to be met by an improvement of the world situation; because much of this is due to fear—whether fear of oppression, fear of other countries spreading out and attacking the interests and privileges of their neighbors. The basic way to move is to create conditions of lessened fear. Having done that, you can then build up that type of United Nations you have suggested.

"Mr. COUSINS. Yes, all over the world, Mr. Prime Minister, wherever I have gone I have

found the fear of which you speak. I have found it in individuals everywhere. In some places that fear resulted in futility, in others defeatism, in others desperation or acute anxiety. Would you agree that the place to start is by eliminating today the cause of fear? What better way to do that than by working inside the United Nations itself to give it the required strength within the required time? What other hope for the world is there?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. That is true. But, again, I repeat that if the United Nations itself in the minds of large numbers of people does not represent the world as a whole it becomes a part of the world and the other part is out of it. That part of it then is not subject to its jurisdiction, and you can only bring it in or deal with it by the policemen's methods—which countries resent. So that instead of assuring peace you are gradually drifting to greater conflicts.

"Mr. COUSINS. I do get your point, Mr. Prime Minister; I was merely anxious to find out from you whether you believe that a proper starting point might perhaps be in the form of a call for a revision conference in the United Nations under articles 108 and 109 of the Charter. Such a revision conference might represent something of a fresh start inside the United Nations, trying to finish the job begun at San Francisco—enormously difficult though that may be. It would bring together—before it is too late—the nations of the world in order to find out to what extent it is now possible to define the basic principles on which workable universal world organization must rest. Assuming that weakness tends to create crisis, how can such weakness as may now exist in the United Nations be eliminated?

"Prime Minister NEHRU. You are referring to a possible revision of the United Nations Charter?

"Mr. COUSINS. Yes, sir.

"Prime Minister NEHRU. Well, perhaps that may be desirable and it may help. Personally, I do not find anything wrong about the United Nations Charter itself. There may be minor procedural matters. It is a very fine charter. The objectives are fine, but still, if a revision is required, certainly we should consider it to make the United Nations more of a universal body. That would no doubt help."

#### FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

To: Department of State.

From: Bombay 885, April 4, 1951.

Reference: Voluntary.

Subject: Leader specialist program, Mr. Norman Cousins.

This consulate general has the honor to report on the successful visit of Mr. Norman Cousins to Bombay during the period February 22 through February 28. By the time Mr. Cousins reached the end of his rapid itinerary he was of course a sick man, having contracted amoebic dysentery in Calcutta. Although this consulate general had made long-range advance plans involving a reasonably heavy schedule for Mr. Cousins, the Embassy in Delhi warned this office 1 day in advance that Mr. Cousins should be handled carefully and should be given as much opportunity to rest as possible. With that warning this office had serious doubts about the possible success of the week, but Mr. Cousins' firm determination to carry through his commitments his physical condition did not seriously interfere with the successful completion of his mission in this area.

Mr. Cousins' public appearances included a press conference on Thursday, February 22, attended by approximately 30 representatives of the major papers in the city, and later on the same day a speech on the subject of "American Public Opinion and Peace" for the Bombay branch of the Indian Council of World Affairs. Approx-

mately 60 members of that organization attended the lecture which was given in the Board room of Bombay House, headquarters of Tatas. On Friday, the 23d, under the sponsorship of the Progressive Group, Mr. Cousins talked to an audience of approximately 300 on the subject of where the peace begins. A speech scheduled in Poona on Saturday the 24th was canceled on the basis of Mr. Cousins' health. On Monday, February 26, Mr. Cousins spoke to 150 people at a meeting arranged by the newly formed Democratic Research Service with his topic "Who Speaks for Peace." On Monday afternoon Mr. Cousins also made a brief appearance in the office of the United States Information Service and spoke to assembled staff members. February the 27th involved two speeches for Mr. Cousins—one at noon for 200 Rotary Club members with his topic, "Don't Resign From the Human Race," the other later that day was a question and answer period concerned with literary subjects arranged by P. E. N. for approximately 70 members and friends.

This catalog of public appearances clearly indicates a deliberate move on the part of this office inasmuch as local organizations were approached to sponsor Mr. Cousins' appearances. The consulate general made no attempt to hide the fact that Mr. Cousins was visiting Bombay under the auspices of the United States Government but it was thought wise to arrange for a recognized local association to actually sponsor his public appearances.

Members of the press attended all of the public lectures and the reporting was in most instances adequate. Typical press reports on the several features are forwarded as enclosures for this dispatch. Few editorial comments appeared pertaining to Mr. Cousins' visit but three are attached as enclosures for this dispatch. A note in Bharat, Congress-owned daily, February 24, inspired by comments made by Mr. Cousins at his Indian Council of World Affairs speech, an editorial in the frequently anti-American Free Press Bulletin, February 28, criticizing Mr. Cousins for his lack of understanding of the basis of India's neutrality, and a favorable brief note in the Bombay Chronicle dated March 1 congratulating Mr. Cousins for his tactfulness in recognizing and commenting on the feeling of frustration found during his visit in India. As usual the party line, Blitz, provided the one false note in reporting American activity in the area. In the issue of March 3 that publication used a brief reference Mr. Cousins had made to the geographic spread of communism as a jumping-off point for additional castigation of the United States. In relation to the extent of Mr. Cousins' activity during the time he was in Bombay it is only surprising that Blitz failed to devote more attention to his visit.

In all his public appearances Mr. Cousins was impressive and although he is not a brilliant orator his texts were more than satisfactory and were delivered with a sincere conviction which impressed his audiences. In each instance Mr. Cousins emerged as a brilliant performer when it came to the question-and-answer period. It was the general consensus of most people who heard him that that portion of each lecture period was by far the most impressive. The questions at one or another session ranged the full gamut of local current thinking about the United States in international relations. Some of the questions recurring more than once were: Why does the United States support reactionary regimes such as Chiang? Why has the United States refused Nehru's mediation? Mr. Cousins' personal views on One World Government? The explanation for the United States' refusal to accept China as a UN member? Why not leave the Koreans to solve their own problems? And an explana-



tion of the differences in the definitions of peace.

The most hard-hitting speech made by Mr. Cousins during the week he was in Bombay was that for the Democratic Research Service. Before Mr. Cousins' arrival the Democratic Research Service had cleared with him asking that he prepare a special speech aimed at an exposé of the phony Soviet peace campaign. Mr. Cousins used it as an opportunity to describe the state of thinking in the United States in the early part of the 1930's and then the progressive disillusionment of America with the international attitude of the Soviet. He also pointed a parallel that he has seen in India today, the current state of confused thinking which he has found similar to that in our own country during the 1930's. The full text of this particular speech was transcribed by tape recorder and is available to the Department if the Department is interested in seeing it. During the question period immediately after that speech the first question was concerned with Mr. Cousins' appearance at the Waldorf-Astoria Peace Meeting in 1947. Mr. Cousins explained at considerable length in an off-the-record fashion the full story behind his invitation from the Peace Committee and the exact sequence of events at the actual meeting at the Waldorf-Astoria. It was one of the most interesting answers given by Mr. Cousins during the whole time he was in the city of Bombay.

An additional interesting press reaction appeared in the Bombay Gujarati daily, Hindustan, a reasonably influential local language newspaper with a circulation of 15,000 copies. In the February 23 issue in a three-column story on Norman Cousins in the literary section of the editorial page, the editor made the following statement:

"Following the visit of the British Council's drama group, the arrival of an author from across the Atlantic will find welcome from all interested in literature. It seems, in this trip Mr. Cousins is going to appear more as a political expert than a man of letters. The topics of his talks deal mainly with democracy, peace, American public opinion, and so on. It is a matter of regret that Bombay will not come to know about the artistic personality of a man who has been editing for 10 years a first-rank literary magazine like the Saturday Review of Literature. If a public talk on some literary subject can still be arranged, it would be worth while. Either at Mr. Cousins' meeting with P. E. N. members or at another suitable occasion, it is necessary to arrange a talk that will throw light upon him as an author and give some idea of contemporary trends in American literature. We hope the USIS will think about this."

One of the staff members in the Gujarati translation section of the office caught the article the morning it appeared and without reference to Mr. Norman Cousins the cultural affairs officer wrote immediately to the editor. The text of the answer is given in full:

"Your article concerning Mr. Norman Cousins has been called to our attention and we would like to report that we completely sympathize with your point of view. In relation to that point of view we deliberately saved one evening of Mr. Cousins' crowded schedule for an opportunity for the members of P. E. N. to meet him. We assume and we early promised Madam Wadia that Mr. Cousins would talk informally at that meeting about the American literary scene and will then be only too glad to answer questions pertinent to the literary field.

"As you are aware most of Mr. Cousins' appearances are concerned with the subject of peace. In relation to the situation of the world in 1951 and in relation to Mr. Cousins' personal convictions this consistent concern should not be a surprise to you or your readers. Mr. Cousins' whole literary life has been

concerned with literature as a living force and with, in 1951 forces in the world threatening life itself, it should not be a surprise to you that much of Mr. Cousins' thinking and talking time is concerned with the \* \* \*. Unfortunately the editor did not choose to publish the answer, but fortunately Mr. Cousins heartily approved of the text and requested a copy for his personal files inasmuch as he regarded it as a clear-cut explanation of the philosophy of his trip.

Mr. Cousins was satisfied with the press conference, which was an extremely lively one in relation to Bombay standards, much as it was off the record, which surprisingly enough reporters did appreciate. The press conference was remarkably free from the needling variety of questions visiting Americans frequently face, and the chief explanation seems to be the sincerity of Mr. Cousins in talking to individuals and groups. He gained the respect of many of the reporters immediately, and held that respect throughout the conference, which lasted for 1 hour and a half. During the week Mr. Cousins was also interviewed for an All India Radio broadcast. The interview was accomplished by Mr. Frank Moraes, the editor of the Times, of India, and the majority of the questions were, of course, literary, inasmuch as All India Radio keeps clear of political commentary.

A fine statement by Mr. Cousins was made during his brief appearance at the United States information center. He told a story concerning his visit to a refugee camp in Delhi during which he encountered a reasonably active Communist propagandist. He used that story as typical of the propaganda campaign being fought in India and finished with a statement which has been repeated to USIS employees throughout India.

"Within a week I shall be leaving India, and you will be here to fight out the battle. It will be easy enough for me back in the United States to talk about the problems and to get American support, because that is easy enough to do at a distance. I do not know whether I will get it, but at least I can talk about it. But you will be here on the firing line, and so I would say to you that in all the world today I can't think of a group of people who have a greater cause to which to dedicate and consecrate themselves than you have, because a lot more is at stake than merely the preservation of this nation or that nation. What is at stake is the preservation of human value. We have got a very tough fight on our hands. But I think it is a fight in which we actually have and can bring greater force to bear than the other side can bring to bear on the problem. I think we have the greater force because I think we have history itself on our side. I do not think that we can do more than fight the good fight. I don't think indeed we can do less than that. But I do think, however, that to do less than that would be treason to the human race."

Based on instructions from Delhi this Consulate General kept Mr. Cousins' social engagements to an absolute minimum. Before word reached this office of the state of his health several social functions had been arranged. Mr. Cousins insisted on carrying through with those functions although he possibly should not have. On Thursday, the 22nd of February, Mr. Minco Masani, the Chairman of the Indian Council of World Affairs, Bombay branch, gave a dinner party involving numerous local personalities Mr. Masani was anxious to have Mr. Cousins meet. On Friday the 23d, the Consul General and Mrs. Childs entertained at a formal buffet supper for Mr. Cousins. That dinner party coincided with the one evening that Mr. and Mrs. George McGhee were in the city on their way to the Colombo Conference and they were of course added to the dinner

list. It gave Mr. Cousins an opportunity to give first hand impressions to Mr. McGhee of his full Indian experience. On Sunday evening, the 25th, the Cultural Affairs Officer, in the absence of the Public Affairs Officer, entertained 50 press people at a reception in Mr. Cousins' honor. The balance of the schedule was kept in the clear and except for small scale luncheon and dinner engagements and numerous private interviews Mr. Cousins was able to obtain some rest during the period he was in the city of Bombay. The best evidence that the Bombay experience was not as disastrous as it could have been is the fact that Mr. Cousins regained four of the seventeen pounds he had lost earlier in India.

In public meetings and in private contacts Mr. Cousins demonstrated to virtually everybody his ability as a thinker and his genuine talents as a person. Few Americans who have visited in this area have made as much of an impression as Mr. Cousins did during the week that he was in the city. The only limitations on the effectiveness of his visit were that of the condition of his health which did prevent him from following the energetic 24-hour-a-day schedule he usually follows and the constant presence of Mr. Julius Stulman, his travelling companion. Mr. Stulman is the subject of a separate despatch.

This Consulate General would like to go on record that the Government-sponsored visit by Mr. Cousins was completely successful and would also like to recommend similar visits arranged by the Government for people as well qualified as Cousins is. Local organizations welcome American speakers and if those speakers are of the caliber of Mr. Cousins the effectiveness of the USIE program will be extended. Additional enclosures to this despatch consist of 4 pictures taken at the press conference and 3 pictures taken during Mr. Cousins' quick visit to the USIS office.

W. CLYDE DUNN,  
*American Consul.*

(Enclosures: 1. Clipping, Free Press Journal, February 23, 1951. 2. Clipping, Times of India, February 23, 1951. 3. Clipping, Bombay Chronicle, February 23, 1951. 4. Clipping, Bharat, February 23, 1951. 5. Clipping, Free Press Journal, February 24, 1951. 6. Clipping, Times of India, February 28, 1951. 7. Clipping, Free Press Journal, February 28, 1951. 8. Clipping, National Standard, February 28, 1951. 9. Clipping, Bombay Chronicle, February 28, 1951. 10. Clipping, Free Press Bulletin, February 28, 1951. 11. Clipping, Bombay Chronicle, March 1, 1951. 12. Clipping, Blitz, March 3, 1951. 13. Photographs, 4 pp.)

[From the Bombay Free Press Journal of February 23, 1951]

FORMATION OF WORLD GOVERNMENT, MR. COUSINS' PLEA

BOMBAY, Thursday.—The need for the formation of a world government functioning under world laws to be evolved by a world body was emphasized by Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, published in the United States, at a press conference here today.

The world government, he said, would enforce peace on all its member nations with a control on common security of individuals and the people.

Mr. Cousins, who is on a lecture tour of India, further stated that the United States had committed a mistake in accepting the right of veto for the Big Five in the Security Council. He regretted that America had followed the policy of isolationism in the past.

The American journalist was emphatically of opinion that a world war was not inevitable, but added: "I will not subscribe,



under any circumstances, to a peace which will cost the moral values."

Referring to the preservation of peace, Mr. Cousins said that only a working partnership between India and America for peace would help the world in maintaining it.

Later, addressing a meeting of the Indian Council of World Affairs at the Bombay House this evening, Mr. Cousins observed that the American press did not necessarily reflect the public opinion in the country. He was speaking on Public Opinion in the United States of America and the Peace.

#### UNITED STATES NEWS

He said he was disturbed to see news from the United States treated in the Indian press as though it actually represented the real opinion of the American people. American news reaching Indian newspapers had to be understood with a proper background to evaluate it in proper perspective, he said.

There were many things in common between the two countries, and the press in both countries which had tremendous responsibilities should work toward bringing about better understanding between the peoples of America and India, Mr. Cousins pleaded.

While asserting that "bad news from America was not the real news," he said that he saw signs of rift between the people of both countries, and this rift would be exploited to create "real rift between us." Mr. Cousins said that he found very little of American literature in the libraries and educational institutions in India, and he thought that more and more American publications should be read by Indians.

He admitted that "shady magazines," which were sold in India in large numbers, had much higher circulation in the United States than the serious type of publications.

[From the Times of India, Colombo, Ceylon, of February 23, 1951]

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF WORLD PEACE—VALUE OF INDO-UNITED STATES AMITY

An active working partnership between India and the United States is the only effective means by which the present drift toward another global conflict, could be avoided and universal peace established, according to Mr. Norman Cousins, noted author and editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature.

Addressing a press conference in Bombay on Thursday, Mr. Cousins, who is on a United States Government-sponsored lecture tour of India, said that these two nations—one representing the east and the other the west—should join hands within the framework of the United Nations and endeavor to work for peace through principles and not through power politics.

Mr. Cousins advocated the development of the United Nations as an organization having the authority to make, enact, enforce and interpret world laws. "Otherwise the United Nations will die and with it the last best hope for achieving peace," he added.

Declaring that another war is not inevitable, the American author, however, added that he did not believe in achieving peace at any price.

#### KNOW EACH OTHER BETTER

Later in the evening, speaking to the members of the Bombay branch of the Indian Council of World Affairs, Mr. Cousins referred to the lack of proper understanding between the peoples of India and the United States.

He remarked that the press and public opinion polls in the United States did not truly reflect the thoughts and views of the people. News, which was considered unimportant in one country, was prominently displayed in the newspapers of the other country, while really important items of news were either treated with scant respect or ignored totally.

Referring to the great part that the two nations had to play in the coming years in shaping world opinion, Mr. Cousins said: "There is a great similarity between America and India. These two countries must work in closer cooperation in the cause of world peace."

Asked to clarify the general misunderstanding that Americans were trigger happy, Mr. Cousins said it was an injustice to the United States—indeed to the human race to say that Americans were war happy.

Mr. M. R. Masani, chairman of the council, presided.

[From Bharat of February 24, 1951]

Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, is obviously a great believer in Indo-American amity. His forcible plea for a better understanding between the two nations will be widely endorsed in this country. It was surprising to hear an outstanding American journalist asking this country not to take the American press as reflecting the public opinion there. His plea to the Indian press to be more broad based in its news treatment of America is unnecessary. The Indian press barring a microscopic minority has never tampered with the weights and measures of news reporting. And toward America, it cannot be said that either the people or the press of this country are hostile in any way. As for Mr. Cousins' assertion that anybody who makes a fool of himself in America gets a front page in India, it may be said that this is the result of the dictum attributed to Northcliffe that when a dog bites a man it is not news, and when a man bites a dog it is news. After all the public are interested in the unusual and the unexpected. There can be no doubt that a working partnership between India and America would increase the chances of peace. This is exactly what Prime Minister Nehru has been attempting, and it was in this spirit that he undertook a tour of the American Continent 2 years ago. Differences of opinion and shifts in emphasis will always mark the relations between two countries; but on the fundamental allegiance to the democratic ideal there can be and ought to be no difference whatsoever between India and the United States.

[From the Free Press Journal of February 24, 1951]

#### OVER-ALL POWER FOR UN—WAY TO SAVE PEACE, SAYS MR. COUSINS

BOMBAY, Friday.—A mandate to the UN Organization to exercise effective control over all nations was the only way to enforce peace in the world and make aggression impossible, stated Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature, here today.

Mr. Cousins, who has been deputed by the Government of the United States to make the American viewpoint known to the Indian people, was addressing a meeting under the Progressive Group at the Taj Mahal Hotel this evening.

This end could be achieved, in Mr. Cousins' opinion, through a working partnership between the people of India and the United States inside the United Nations Organization to correct the errors of the past few years and to find the basis of a revised UN in which it would be possible for all nations to come in without alining themselves into power blocs.

#### UNITED STATES INTENTIONS

The much maligned and much misunderstood Government of the United States, Mr. Cousins said, was working for peace, and it was not true that it was concerned only with war. There was a tremendous movement for peace in his country, the speaker declared.

Mr. Cousins urged that the frightful possibilities of atomic warfare should impress on the people of the world that they could no longer afford to make any mistake which

would have frightful results. Looking at the pattern of culture of the twentieth century which was a pattern of destruction, the people had the right to ask, "Where are the forces in the world that speak peace, speak for man?" And yet, Mr. Cousins wailed, all over the world the people were indulging in the luxury of nationalism in the awful game of power politics.

Peace was possible even at this late day if the United Nations was strengthened so as to have powers of law and compulsory jurisdiction over nations, he declared.

[From the Times of India, Colombo, Ceylon, of February 28, 1951]

#### "INDIA IS HOPE OF WORLD" UNITED STATES EDITOR'S VIEW

Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, told the Bombay Rotary Club on Tuesday that there was no scope for mediation of the problems facing the world today.

Mr. Cousins, who was speaking on the subject Don't Resign From the Human Race, said that India today was in a unique position, not to mediate, but to create or design a framework within which it might be possible to prevent the world "from blowing up in one last explosion."

Wherever he had been, particularly in France, Germany, Austria, and the Scandinavian countries, during the last 3 years, he had observed a feeling of fatalism—"existentialism" and "inevitabilism" were the synonyms Mr. Cousins used—a feeling of resignation from the problems facing the entire human race.

"Today in India," Mr. Cousins said, "I feel, on the basis of my very short trip that there is a summing up of almost everything I found elsewhere. But India may be the last place in the world to reflect the feeling to resign from the human race. India is the hope of the world. No nation throughout history had more to offer to humanity at large than India has today."

"India today is the hope of the world. No nation in history, indeed, had so much to offer for the building up of an enduring peace and for the defense of the basis for an enlargement of the human species. I leave India with very high hopes."

India, Mr. Cousins added, in solving her problems, could be an inspiration to the entire world. India was the laboratory of the future. India was the largest nation in the world outside the totalitarian "bloc"—a nation which could provide an answer to totalitarianism. India had the means to advance the cause of world peace, not by mediation, but by the creation of a framework within which the rights of people could be enforced.

Rotarian-President Niren N. Ghose was in the chair. Rotarian Dr. F. P. Antia proposed a vote of thanks.

[From the Free Press Journal of February 28, 1951]

#### "GIVE UP FALSE NEUTRALITY," UNITED STATES EDITOR'S TIP TO INDIA

BOMBAY, Tuesday.—India should give up its path of mediation and false neutrality and take the lead in establishing peace and order in the world by creating an enduring framework of law within the United Nations, Mr. Norman Cousins, Editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature, stated here today.

Mr. Cousins, who was addressing the Rotary Club this afternoon, declared that there was no common meeting ground between the two different groups of the world. World peace and order could be established only if a strong and fearless attitude was taken up in the United Nations. He advocated a strong approach to the problems at present facing the world.

Mr. Cousins was of the opinion that India could rightly take the lead in the UN as no



nation had more to offer to itself, and to the world than this country.

His impression of the country, he said, was that uncertainty, defeatism, helplessness and inertia, which were the bane of European countries, were more apparent in India than anywhere else.

[From the National Standard of February 28, 1951]

#### INDIA ABLE TO PREVENT WORLD FROM BLOWING UP, SAYS UNITED STATES EDITOR

"India is in an unique position to create the framework within which it is possible to keep the world from blowing up," declared Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature, when he addressed the Rotary Club in Bombay on Tuesday.

Mr. Cousins added that to create such a framework of world laws to provide a structure within which the rules of the game would be properly observed, the path of mediation and false neutrality should be given up and a straight and fearless attitude be taken up before the United Nations.

Mr. Cousins said, no nation has more to offer to itself and more to offer to the world at large than the people of India.

Summing up his impressions, Mr. Cousins observed that whatever problems he had found elsewhere in the world, the prevailing feeling of uncertainty, defeatism, helplessness, and inertia, were present in India in a more intense form.

#### FALSE NATIONAL BARRIERS

Elaborating on the subject of his speech, Don't Resign From the Human Race, Mr. Cousins said that in France, Germany, Austria, Scandinavia, and other countries, the same attitude of despair and defeatism prevailed and people were taking refuge behind false national barriers instead of facing what was happening around them in the world squarely.

Stressing the need for resolution and a strong approach to the present world crisis, Mr. Cousins observed that India today was the hope of the world. Calling for a positive approach he stated that there could be no mediation as there was no common ground between the differing groups. Either there was aggression or there was not. "If there is aggression, let us meet it fearlessly," he declared. The only way to meet aggression was by creating an enduring framework of world laws and their enforcement by the United Nations.

[From the Bombay Chronicle of February 28, 1951]

#### INDIA IS HOPE OF FREE WORLD, MR. COUSINS' VIEW

BOMBAY, Tuesday.—"As the largest free nation outside the totalitarian regime, India is the hope of the world," declared Mr. Norman Cousins, American journalist and author, addressing the Bombay Rotary Club Tuesday afternoon.

"India is in a unique position to design the framework within which to keep the world from blowing up in one great explosion," he added.

Mr. Cousins pointed out that India was an inspiration to the rest of the world in that she was striving to build up a stable economy and to raise the general standard of living of the masses without infringing human freedom.

The speaker said that wherever he visited there was a feeling of defeatism and fatalism discernible. All these problems in a most complicated, complex and intensified form faced India. No nation in history had to face such great difficulties in the post-independence era than India and he paid a

tribute to the leadership of the country on their achievements in these trying times.

"I am leaving India in very high hopes," he concluded.

Rotarian president, N. N. Ghose, was in the chair. A vote of thanks was proposed by Dr. F. P. Antia.

[From the Free Press Journal of February 28, 1951]

#### FALSE NEUTRALITY

Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the American Saturday Review of Literature, has been at considerable pains to tell us that our neutrality is false and our path of mediation wrong.

He would probably like us very much to join hands with the United States of America.

Obviously, our learned guest has neither understood nor probed more deeply into the reasons that have motivated India to take the stand she has consistently taken so far.

Even a casual study of India's foreign policy will show that her main desire has been to maintain peace, to promote understanding among the peoples of the world.

Inevitably, this leads to misunderstanding and heartburnings.

India has decided to risk unfriendliness.

She has been accused of siding now with the democratic bloc and again with the Communist bloc.

This only proves the contention that India has been playing fair with the peoples—not with governments.

India has been playing an unenviable role.

She can at best take comfort in the thought that she has been playing true to herself.

Polonius' advice is good as much for nations as for individuals.

India has never been neutral toward the people.

She has consistently championed their cause in the United Nations Organization.

This is a positive policy, as contrasted with the constant shifting that the United States has been indulging.

Mr. Cousins might read the Bible (St. Matthew, ch. 7):

"Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?"

"First cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

[From the Bombay Chronicle of March 1, 1951]

#### A MATTER OF CONFIDENCE

Mr. Norman Cousins who has just concluded a brief visit to India, managed with supreme tact to convey pleasantly to Indians that he found predominant here a sense of frustration. Mr. Cousins is not the only visitor to make this discovery though others hesitate between politely suppressing their feeling and brusquely disclosing it. It is not always that a distinguished foreigner on a flying visit trusts his own judgment sufficiently to risk hurting the feelings of his host on what might very well be a mistaken opinion. And those who remain longer, when they do not change their ideas, have several valid reasons for not speaking with candor. But it is a general impression with foreign visitors that the national spirit which one would expect to see in a country that has just gained freedom, was not very evident. One observer felt that the middle classes who should be the foremost in this kind of enthusiasm, were strangely lethargic and even indifferent. "Labor," he said, "and the peasantry can be roused to disinterested national effort when the occasion requires it; but the middle classes are different." There

is a great deal which is brought into controversy by this analysis, and the middle class in India has had very little to feel pleased about.

[From Blitz of March 3, 1951]

#### WORDS AND DEEDS

Addressing the inaugural meeting of the Democratic Research Service (whatever that may be—but we have our own suspicions) at (your guess is right) the Indian Merchants Chamber, Bombay, Mr. Norman Cousins, American author and editor of The Saturday Review of Literature, urged Indians to judge those who claimed to work for peace not by their words but by their deeds. So we shall brudder. But you won't like it.

Disregarding words of Mr. Cousins and his compatriots, let us judge the American's professions of peace and democracy by some of their deeds—e. g. (1) Hiroshima. (2) Lynching. (3) Poli tax. (4) Atom-bomb manufacture. (5) Atom-bomb Russia propaganda. (6) War bases all over the world. (7) American rearmament of Fascist Japan and Nazi Germany. (8) American troops, planes, and armament in Britain, France, Belgium, Holland, Turkey, Greece, etc.

Another simple test, Mr. Cousins to judge the comparative peaceful intentions of Soviet Russia and the United States of America: How many American troops today are to be found outside the frontiers of the United States of America? How many Russian troops are to be found outside the frontiers of U. S. S. R.?

We shall judge your deeds, Mr. Cousins but, suppose the verdict is "Guilty?"

#### FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

To: Department of State (for IEP).

From: New Delhi, India, No. 2237, March 30, 1951.

Reference: Depcirtel 312, December 27, 1950. Subject: Exchange of persons: American leader program, visit of Mr. Norman Cousins to Delhi area.

Mr. Norman Cousins arrived on February 10, 1951, from Lahore and left for Bombay on February 21. He returned to Delhi on February 28 and left again on March 3. During that time, Mr. Cousins gave seven lectures, was entertained at two teas, one dinner, one reception and at quite a large number of unscheduled social engagements. Also Mr. Cousins gave his time to all who wanted to see him and had several appointments with government officials, cabinet ministers, and one luncheon engagement, one dinner engagement, and two other appointments with the Prime Minister. He made two tape recordings with the Prime Minister, granted only on condition that they be used by NBC in the United States. He also made two recordings for All India Radio and toured some of the refugee camps.

Mr. Cousins was ill with dysentery while here, and therefore much of his tour was canceled. He also preferred a light schedule here so that he could devote more time to talking with an interviewing Government officials.

The tour program (see enclosure 1).

#### RADIO BROADCASTS

His first broadcast was an interview with Harindranath Chattopadhyaya, one of India's leading poets and a pronounced Communist. The full text of approximately 30 minutes was edited down to 12 minutes. The interview was planned to be on cultural subjects, mostly writers and their works, but many "loaded" questions were asked. However, because of the policy of All India Radio, all objectionable material was deleted. The first broadcast was effective.



tive, and Mr. Cousins handled himself very well.

The other broadcast was on the Brains Trust program. Here questions are placed before a panel for discussion. The panel consisted of Mr. Jack Hughes, master of ceremonies, and from the British Information Service, New Delhi, Dr. K. G. Saiyadain, of the Ministry of Education, Dr. K. S. Krishna, director, National Physical Laboratory, Father D'Souza, Catholic priest and member of Parliament, and Mr. Norman Cousins. The questions ranged from "If science keeps advancing at its present rate, man will eventually destroy himself," to "Discuss the statement that 'Women are the better half.'"

In this second broadcast the discussion was extremely interesting, and with Mr. Cousins' sharp wit and humor, there was favorable comment among those who heard it.

He was requested to make further broadcast recordings, but found it impossible because of lack of time.

Press coverage (see enclosure 3 and press clippings.)

Enclosed are two press releases put out by USIS on Mr. Cousins' tour of the Delhi area. Mr. Cousins' visit received extensive coverage in the majority of the Delhi area newspapers. Enclosed also is a press release of one of Mr. Cousins' interviews with Prime Minister Nehru.

#### POINTS OF EMPHASIS

1. Mr. Cousins stressed the point that there must be a peace with justice through a world federation, and that this federation must be supported by all nations of the world which will give the federation power to make and enforce laws.

2. He said that there must be better Indo-American relations since India has all the potentialities of becoming to the East what America is to the West. Therefore, the two countries must cooperate to create a better world.

3. He said that to achieve better relations (and he stressed this point in every speech), there would have to be a truer writing of the news. He said that if he were an Indian reading the Indian newspapers, he would have nothing to do with America because they (Indian newspapers) give front page headline coverage to American news items such as murder, rape, and statements by irresponsible nitwits, but some really important philanthropic event is hidden in the back pages in a two- or three-line article. He admitted that the same was done in some American newspapers but that the true facts could also be read in many others.

4. He expressed the opinion that after there is a working world federation, there must be a respect among all nations and all peoples for the rights of the individual and of the nations as individuals. He said that the United Nations could be such an organization if the nations of the world would drop all selfish aims and ambitions and work together for the benefit of mankind to abolish greed, want, and fear, and settle by discussion any misunderstanding that might arise.

Following every lecture, there was a question-and-answer period, and in his replies Mr. Cousins was at his best. Those questions most frequently asked were:

1. Is there discrimination against Negroes in the United States?

Yes. We have racial discrimination in the United States. But after a people have been kept in slavery for a hundred years and then are granted their freedom, it is not easy for those who have been masters to accept them as equals. You have the same problem in India with your untouchables.

In America, during the past 25 years, there have been great forward strides to abolish discrimination. However, you in your newspapers read nothing about this. You read only the bad aspects of discrimination and cannot know what forward steps have been

and are being taken to do away with discrimination.

2. Why was Pakistan not considered an aggressor in Kashmir when China was branded as such in Korea?

I do not feel qualified to discuss the Kashmir question since I do not know the many intricacies involved and am not an expert on the subject. However, I hope that India and Pakistan can settle their dispute amicably between themselves.

3. Is it true that civil rights are becoming non-existent in the United States?

No. It is not true. From your newspaper accounts of the Martinville Negroes and the Communist incidents (things which were always cited by the audience), it is no wonder that you have such ideas. However, we have been going through a bad time—a time of unrest and readjustment. We are beginning now to come out of it. India is going through such a time now, and I am sure she will come out of it.

4. Did the United States drop the atomic bomb on Japan because of racial discrimination?

No. There was no discrimination involved. I have seen the cities of Europe, and the damage done there by bombings was much worse than that done by the atomic bomb in Japan. In Europe, it was not just a few cities but many or all of the large ones. I feel that perhaps Japan should have been warned and given the opportunity to end the war before the bomb was dropped. However, if everyone could see the destruction in both Europe and Japan, as I have, I feel sure there would be no feelings whatsoever about racial prejudice unless it were against Europe.

5. Do you think the United States Congress will grant the wheat to India? What is American public opinion on this?

Yes. I think the wheat will be given to India. However, we are damned if we do and damned if we don't. It is the same all over the world.

If we give someone something, they damn us for giving it because we are showing our superiority as the "haves" over the "have nots." Also, if we don't give it, we are damned because we have it and won't give it. However, since it is a matter of conscience and since in a thing of this sort Americans are ruled by conscience, I feel that public opinion will be in favor of the wheat grant.

#### EVALUATION

The embassy regards short-term visits of American lecturers of the highest priority value for both short-term and long-term objectives. This informal person-to-person exchange of prominent, mature American leaders is invaluable, by supplementing the existing official exchanges, in increasing international understanding.

Particularly in India, where there is so much social, economic and cultural change during the first years of its national life, American leaders, by first-hand contacts and frank discussions with important people and organizations, will learn how Indians think about the rest of the world.

The embassy believes that these leaders should not only be sponsored by the Department, but also by private organizations and foundations possibly subsidized for this purpose by the United States Government.

Mr. Cousins' impact in Delhi was noticeable. Audiences and private interviewers liked him and seemed to be swayed, at least for the moment. He was sincere in his approach and in his interest in the opinions of others. He met and talked with all who wanted to see him.

His speeches were extemporaneous and varied in their appeal. However, he devoted much of his time to answering questions, and at this he was very adept. He occasionally showed himself somewhat too glib but gave no real offense. His listeners were

always interested, if not always satisfied by his answers.

The total observable effect of the visit has convinced the embassy that it is important to have in India many alert and liberal leaders—talking, talking, talking. They should be tireless in their patience, but quick to present effectively American principles.

#### SUGGESTIONS

Because Mr. Cousins was under the sponsorship of the Department of State, many of the Indians felt that his speeches and discussions were strictly propaganda. It might be possible, in the future, to get some nongovernment organizations or institutions to sponsor some of the leaders officially with unofficial departmental backing.

It is suggested that something of the personality and habits of the leader be forwarded to each post for use in the preparation of the tour program. Along with this should be sent the leader's biography to be used by the posts in the preparation of press releases and other material. Those organizations and groups to whom the leader is to speak might make use of the biography in the selection of topics for the speeches.

Whenever possible, each visiting lecturer, at least those under the Department of State's program, should visit Delhi first for briefing and the working out of an integrated and well-planned program throughout India.

Public Affairs Section:

CLARE H. TIMBERLAKE,  
Counselor and Chief Public Affairs  
Officer.

(For the Ambassador).

(Enclosures: 1. Tour program of Mr. Cousins. 2. Clippings: (a) Times of India, February 17, 1951. (b) Times of India, February 15, 1951. (c) Indian News Chronicle, February 17, 1951. (d) Statesman, February 17, 1951. (e) Indian News Chronicle, February 20, 1951. (f) Hindustan Times, February 20, 1951. 3. Press releases.)

UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE,  
American Embassy, New Delhi.

(For release in the morning papers of  
Wednesday, March 7, 1951)

NEW DELHI, March 6, 1951.—Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, who has just completed a 2-month good-will tour of India, had several conversations with Prime Minister Nehru. During the course of the conversations they discussed the proposal now before the United States Congress providing for the shipment of wheat to India. Prime Minister Nehru authorized Mr. Cousins to release to the press the following statements from their conversations:

"Mr. Cousins, Mr. Prime Minister, before we conclude these discussions, I wonder if I might ask you a question that has to do with Indian-American relations. Some of the newspapers I happened to have seen here in India during the past few weeks have suggested that if America sends wheat, it will do so out of purely selfish motives. Would you care to comment on that?"

"Prime Minister NEHRU. You have been here for 2 months or more and no doubt you have read many of our newspapers. No doubt you have seen that a good many of them have criticized our government—sometimes vigorously, sometimes quite violently, sometimes even worse. Well, I hope you realize that we have some freedom of the press here. Secondly, that some of the newspapers are very good and some of them not so good. Anyhow, to answer your question, just do not understand any individual or newspaper saying that. We have always wanted not only the general cooperation of America but particular assistance in the things we need.

"A year and a half ago, when I went to the United States, food was the basic need



and I mentioned it, and I have often been surprised to hear that people were saying that they gathered the impression that we never really wanted help. It amazes me. We want all the help in the world from everyone in the world. But it is also true, and this is what Mahatma Gandhi taught us, that we must learn to stand on our own feet. Too much reliance on outside help means that you do not grow properly, that you do not strengthen yourself. That is true, but in the matter of wheat, we have wanted it; we want it badly; we are facing a very severe crisis. We don't shout about it quite so much perhaps as we might; it is unbecoming to shout. But the fact is that our need is very great. We welcome the suggestions made in America—in the Congress there—that a large quantity of wheat will be coming, and we shall look forward to it."

Mr. Cousins' visit to India was made under the auspices of the United States State Department Cultural Exchange Program. His lecture tour took him to Madras, Calcutta, New Delhi, and Bombay, where he made numerous addresses to university, college, and civic groups on American Public Opinion, Democracy in the World Today, and many related subjects. He left New Delhi last Saturday for Bombay to enplane on his return trip to the United States. He expected to visit Cairo, Athens and several other European cities before reaching New York City on March 15.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION SERVICE,  
AMERICAN EMBASSY,  
New Delhi.

(For immediate release)

#### MR. NORMAN COUSINS ON VISIT TO DELHI

NEW DEHLY, February 10, 1951.—Mr. Norman Cousins, noted American author and editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature*, is visiting Delhi for a series of lectures and informal discussions with educational and civic groups. He also will meet prominent Government officials and Indian cultural leaders to discuss various aspects of bettering Indo-American relations.

From February 13 to February 16, Mr. Cousins will go to Lucknow, Kanpur, and Allahabad. In Lucknow, he will lecture at the Lucknow University. The lectures at Kanpur and Allahabad will be given under the auspices of the Indian Council of World Affairs. He will also speak at the university in Allahabad.

When he returns to Delhi on Friday, February 16, he will address the Indian Council on World Affairs on the philosophy of American democracy.

Mr. Cousins will travel to Aligarh on Saturday, February 17, where he will speak at the Muslim University.

On February 19 and 20 respectively, Mr. Cousins will lecture at the University of Delhi on Public Opinion in the United States and at St. Stephen's College on Conditions of Democracy in the Modern World.

During his stay Mr. Cousins plans to see Agra and other ancient historical monuments in the Delhi area.

Well-known in world literary circles, Mr. Cousins is making a tour of India under the sponsorship of the Department of State of the United States, in the interest of cementing friendship and understanding between the peoples of India and America.

Thirty-eight-year-old Mr. Cousins graduated from the Teachers' College, University of Columbia in 1933. Though trained to be a teacher, he joined an editorial position in the *New York Post* and a year later he became the book critic of the magazine, *Current History*. Five years later he was appointed as the executive editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature*. Here he won fame by his outspoken and realistic writings which linked literature with current events. His feature articles broke the monotony of

straight book reviews and set a new pattern of journalistic writing.

Mr. Cousins has lectured extensively on books and world affairs. He is also an author of repute. The *Good Inheritance* and *Modern Man Is Obsolete* are two of his well-known works.

A member of the board of directors of the Great Books Foundation, Mr. Cousins is also the vice president of the PEN, the international organization of authors. He is deeply interested in music and has composed over half a dozen musical scores.

Mr. Julius Stulman, an American economist and industrialist, is accompanying Mr. Cousins in order to observe and study economic conditions in India.

#### TOUR PROGRAM

1. February 12, 1951, 5 p. m.: Tea at Ambassador's. (Present were Government officials and leading newspaper and magazine editors.) Mr. Cousins made a short speech on Public Opinion in India and in the United States.

2. February 14, 1951: Lectures at Mahanand Mission Harijan College at Ghaziabad, and at Central Institute of Education on Foreign Policy of United States of America.

3. February 16, 1951, 6 p. m.: Lecture before Indian Council of World Affairs at Constitution Club, New Delhi, on Philosophy of American Democracy. (Note clipping from *Times of India* of February 17, 1951. The last paragraph misquotes Cousins altogether. It has made Mr. Cousins responsible for what was really the text of Mr. Ayyanger's speech during the 50-minute rebuttal period following Mr. Cousins' 40-minute speech.)

4. February 17, 1951: Motored to Aligarh where he met and talked with the vice chancellor of Muslim University, Dr. Zakir Husain. He also visited the Yogi school in Aligarh where he gave a short unscheduled lecture.

5. February 19, 1951, 5 p. m.: Lecture at the University of Delhi, Convocation Hall, on Public Opinion in India and in the United States. The attendance here was very poor. Because of the death of a minister, classes had been dismissed in the morning. This office was not notified nor was the university willing to reschedule the speech.

6. February 19, 1951, 7:30 p. m.: Cocktail party at William C. Bourne's (information officer and attaché) residence to meet the representatives of the local press.

7. February 20, 1951, 9:35 a. m.: Lecture at St. Stephen's College, Assembly Hall, Delhi, on Condition of Democracy in the Modern World.

8. February 20, 1951, 7:30 p. m.: Dinner at St. Stephen's College students' dining hall, followed by an informal discussion period in the students' lounge with 20 of the leading students.

[From the *Hindustan Times* of February 20, 1951]

#### INDIAN CONGRESS FOR CULTURAL FREEDOM

Dr. Norman Cousins, editor, *Saturday Review of Literature*, will lead a discussion on the world movement for cultural freedom. Constitution Club, 5 p. m.

[From the *Times of India* of February 15, 1951]

#### INCREASED POWER FOR UNITED NATIONS—UNITED STATES JOURNALIST'S VIEW

Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature*, of New York, said in an interview in New Delhi on Wednesday that the "United States and India could save the peace by coming together in a working partnership inside the United Nations."

Such partnership, he said, could lead the way to an enforceable system of world law through the fullest development of the

United Nations. In particular, he urged that both countries, in their respective positions of leadership in east and west, should make a joint proposal to the world for an early revision conference of the United Nations aimed at a drastic strengthening of the UN Charter.

"The United Nations must be vested with the powers to make, enforce, and interpret world law," he said. "It must enjoy compulsory jurisdiction only in clearly defined matters related to world security."

Mr. Cousins is on a lecture tour in India and Pakistan under the cultural exchange program sponsored by the United States Government.

[From the *Indian News Chronicle* of February 20, 1951]

#### INDIA CAN HELP U. S. A. KEEP WORLD PEACE

DELHI, Monday.—That America had not been properly understood and represented and "no one really speaks for U. S." was revealed by Dr. Norman Cousins, a visiting American editor, in a lecture this evening in the Delhi University. He was speaking on American Public opinion. Dr. S. N. Sen, vice chancellor, presided.

Dr. Cousins said that several misunderstandings had cropped in India leading to distrust of Americans. He urged for a better understanding of the Americans by the people of this country. He said this was essential for world peace.

Dr. Cousins added that it was true that America had not responded to India's needs with the promptness and in a measure as was expected. But it was not due to any apathy or for any "political" consideration on the part of the Americans. It was due only to the fact that very little was known there about Indian needs and conditions in general.

He referred to the recent appeal for wheat by India. He said that no American knew as to what India's real needs were.

He however promised that when he returns to his country he would take up the matter with United States newspaper men, writers and also in the next meeting of the PEN.

#### PSYCHOLOGY OF PEOPLE

Dr. Sen in his presidential remarks said that to understand Indian opinion it was essential to understand the psychology of the Indian people. Indians he added were essentially for peace for their very salvation lay in peace. He hoped that the Indian Government would cooperate with the United States Government in the maintenance of an "honorable peace."

[From the *Statesman* of February 17, 1951]  
CONDITIONS FOR DEMOCRACY—UNITED STATES EDITOR'S ADDRESS

Addressing a meeting of the Indian Council of World Affairs in New Delhi on Friday, Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the United States magazine, the *Saturday Review of Literature*, said that if the democratic way of life was to be maintained and enlarged, it must form part of a world structure.

Speaking on the Conditions for Democracy, he said that the world had become a geographic unit. To make it fit for human habitation, there was need for both an overall economic integration and adoption of measures to safeguard the individual's rights against the State. This could be achieved only if the threat of aggression was removed and for this a world organization with powers to enact and enforce international law was essential.

He suggested that a revisionary conference of the UN be called and provision made for a world federal government with powers to prevent aggression. It was not worth while, he pointed out, to have peace at the cost of justice.



As leaders of the east and the west, India and the United States of America had a great responsibility in mobilizing public opinion and working in partnership for the achievement of world conditions in which democracy could spread.

[From the Times of India of February 17, 1951]

**PLEA FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT—ERADICATION OF RACIAL BARRIERS URGED**

The Indian people would support the ideal of a World Federal Government only if the participating white nations shed all colonialism and removed all barriers—social, political, economic, and geographic—against all colored peoples, said Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar, deputy speaker of Parliament, in New Delhi on Friday.

He was presiding over an Indian Council of World Affairs meeting, addressed by Mr. Norman Cousins, editor of the Saturday Review of Literature, New York, who emphasized the need for Indo-American cooperation for a revision of the United Nations Charter to provide for a World Federal Government.

Mr. Cousins said that unless the world discovered a design for itself as a whole the strains and stresses on democracy in each individual country would continue to increase.

Only by solving the world problems in a democratic manner and by treating the world as a single unit could the problems of individual democracies be solved, he said. "The world has become too small for provincialism," he emphasized.

What mattered was not the mere superstructure of a world government, but the character of the law on which it was to be based. Such a system, he said, should not rely merely on western conception of democracy, which, he said, had condoned the oppression of colonial people, as in South Africa and the barring of the entry of colored people into countries such as Australia and Canada. Even the western economic system involved the concentration of wealth in a few hands, a system that could not work in eastern countries, where the pressure of population was high. He wanted the western system of political and economic democracy to be developed to suit eastern conditions. Such an experiment was already being tried in the East, particularly in China.

[From the Indian News Chronicle of February 17, 1951]

**NATIONS URGED TO STRIVE FOR WORLD PEACE—COUSINS' APPEALS FOR INDO-UNITED STATES COOPERATION**

NEW DELHI, Friday.—A fervent appeal to the people of the world to come together and dissolve their differences and help the cause of peace was made this evening by Dr. Norman Cousins, a visiting American editor. He was speaking on "Conditions of Democracy in United States of America and Other Countries" at the Constitution Club under the auspices of the Indian Council of World Affairs. Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar presided.

Dr. Cousins said that it was time that the people of the world realized how tragic another war would be. If they failed to prevent it, then in his view they had no right to call themselves civilized and democratic. The only manner in which they could help bring about peace in the world was, he said, that all nations strengthen the hands of the UN. He made a special appeal to India for cooperation as the leader of the eastern countries. He thought that if the United States and India could work together for the cause of peace then much could be achieved both in and outside the UN.

He added that if the majority of the member nations of the UN wanted peace then they could call for the holding of a revision conference by a two-thirds majority in the UN. The decisions of such a revision conference, he said, would not be subject to veto. In this manner a headway could be made toward forming a world federal government, which could both enact and enforce laws for the maintenance of world peace.

**DESIGN FOR DEMOCRACY**

In the course of his lecture, Dr. Cousins said that there were three basic provisions for the functioning of a democratic government in any country—existence of a design for democracy both in that country and in the world at large economic integration on a large scale with the rest of the world (this he termed as substance for world peace); and some unity of concept in the relations between the state and the individual, meaning thereby freedom of individual's body and mind.

He said here that in Japan the first prerequisite for a democratic set-up had been somewhat realized. The present-day Japan, he said, was a much more industrialized country, a healthier place to live in—the death rate having fallen from 27.7 to 11.4 percent—and was economically fast progressing. But he added that unless the general atmosphere in the world did not change, nothing much could be accomplished by individual nations in completing their democratization.

Concluding, he told the gathering not to be misguided by exaggerated press reports and start thinking that the Americans had gone hysterical due to the pressure of the present world situation and the power of their arms.

Mr. Minoo Masani, M. P., speaking on the occasion, said that Dr. Cousins' ideas and beliefs were greatly affected by those of Mahatma Gandhi who also was opposed to war and wanted an honorable peace for the people of the world.

[From the Forum of March 11, 1951]

**CREATION OF A WORLD INSTITUTE**

(By Julius Stulman)

The world has struggled a long time to find its answers and it has had to grow up. Man has fought and competed for the world's goods and glory with an utter disregard of the fact that he is part of the human family and that in the ultimate end he can only create chaos, depressions, suffering, and revolutions by building individual pyramids for himself and his close associates.

What we have to learn about our free economic system and democratic order is that the individual is entitled to rise higher and higher only as he helps to broaden and widen the base below him, so that the whole structure rises together. He has to work on this principle: That his goal is not alone to erect a sharp pinnacle of personal wealth and special privilege for himself—which inherently leads to self-destruction—but to guide the building of that broader, stronger structure in whose benefits he and all the others will share.

The world is hungry today for limitless quantities of goods and is starving for the productive skills, the administrative genius, the technical know-how which the leaders of our free enterprise system can provide. Must they be swept aside by revolution? Must they be shackled by the bureaucratic rules and regulations of self-keeping politicians? Must they always be guided and goaded by legislation? I say they need not be.

Our businessmen are not demons. Most of them have excellent intentions. But a great many of them are men who fail in their thinking. They fail to see their re-

sponsibilities to their fellow men and to the very democratic, free enterprise system from which they have extracted such profit.

To correct this kind of error, we have to start by recognizing that there is purpose and plan and function in God's order for the universe and for man.

In the economic realm we have to act on the assumption that the purpose of an economic system is to call forth and organize the productive skills and powers of men, to create abundance and to see that that abundance is fairly distributed. We will not have that kind of economic system if we leave matters to blind chance. And we will not get that kind of system if we try to legislate it into being, if we try to create it through a giant Government bureaucracy. We must also warn ourselves against thinking in terms of labels, of taking words for the real thing.

**A VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION**

It is with thoughts like these in mind that I have proposed the creation of a world institute, a voluntary association of men dedicated to the integrated, ethical, and material development of man. That is a tall order, I know, but this is a time for tall deeds if we are to survive at all.

Cutting across the artificial boundaries of race and nationality, the world institute would, on the one hand, promote the study of the new integrated science of human behavior and the study of scientific and technical developments needed to lift world living standard. On the other hand, it would also attempt to take concrete measures, area by area, to promote educational, economic, and social development.

Here is how it would work. The world institute would be directed by outstanding men and women drawn from many lands. One of their primary responsibilities would be to determine what educational program and research studies should be made and what development projects should be undertaken in each area. They would endeavor to become a great cooperative body for the common good. Rising above the limitations of personal greed and the special interests of the nation, the class, the private corporation, they would devote their skills to planning out what needs to be done to raise the level of life—and how to do it.

Specifically, perhaps the first projects of the institute, in addition to its educational program, would involve the establishment of enterprises and local institutes in underdeveloped regions in Asia or Latin America.

[From the Bombay Chronicle of February 27, 1951]

**IN A CHINA SHOP**

(By Taurus)

I walked into a room in the Taj Mahal Hotel one day last week. As I was some 10 minutes late for a press conference, I walked in as quietly as I could, little realizing that I had interrupted a veritable barrage of words by walking right across the line of fire. Wayne Hartwell who was seated farthest from the door, murmured that I must have met Mr. Stulman already. As I sat down in a chair next to Wayne, I looked around for the man and missed him because I was looking in the wrong place. Then I knew.

"\* \* \* that is the point," said a soft voice which seemed to have been at it like the ticking of a clock eternally and untiringly. "I see everywhere around me in India so much possibilities: In the sun, in the air, in the sea, and even in the earth at our feet. And the people are so intelligent. Yet there is so much frustration around."

"It is simple and all things are simple, if you will only understand them. Take an ordinary typewriter. If, when I am typing



at it, my man walks in and sees me doing my work and watches me and I ask him, 'Can you do this?' sure, he will answer, 'Yes, I can.' And being intelligent, thinking to himself, 'What Sahib can do, I, too, can do; why not,' he will set himself down to bang away at the keys. And the machine will break down and he will not know what just must be done to set it right. And he will feel quite puzzled. If he were just plain stupid, he would not suffer like this. He will say, 'I can't do this by myself,' and he will sit down to see the machine broken down into bits and to understand everything about it until he has got it all in.

"I am not blaming him. Why I would do the same thing myself. So would all intelligent persons. Wouldn't you do that yourself, Wayne?"

From Wayne, who was looking at the ceiling in a slightly befuddled state, came the discreet affirmation, "Sure, that's just what I would do."

"Sure, you would," continued the gentle purr, as though Wayne had not spoken at all. "Why, so would all of us. So do Indians. I don't blame them. Would you blame them? Why, no. No one can blame them. And there we are all stuck, like a precocious child which, after he tried to imitate the grown-ups, develops all kinds of fixations and ends up at the psychiatrists. How must we get out of this? What must we do to escape from this vicious circle?"

I looked furtively at my watch. Mr. Stulman had covered a great deal of ground and done it all single-voiced, except for Wayne's gallant support unnecessarily rendered at one brief second. And he seemed good for another day. I had another appointment. Dimly I cursed myself for coming and shook myself to catch up with that voice which raced endlessly through solar boxes, molasses utilization, a huge Heath Robinson pipe across the island of Bombay which would filter the seawater of all its valuable minerals and pour out the water at the other end.

It was all more than I could take in at one sitting and more than any man should give out at one, either. But Mr. Stulman's million-dollar ideas were inexhaustible. At one point, the soft voice alarmed us by saying that it had not yet begun.

Then with one superhuman effort, we all staggered out. Fearful, says the Gita, is the dharma of another. Certainly, Mr. Stulman had established the principle.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have been told just recently, this morning, in fact, that the Voice of America is now putting on considerable emphasis on the article that appears in the morning paper, that the American boys going to Europe were going to fight under one flag and that the American flag, with the stars and stripes, would not be in evidence. I wonder what effect that would have on the mothers and fathers of American boys in this country when they have to send their sons to Europe to fight under a flag other than their own. I understand the Voice of America is featuring that very thing.

Mr. ROONEY. Is General Eisenhower proposing that? I have not seen the article to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I saw it in the paper, and it makes my heart sick.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the gentleman the newspaper article to which he refers?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I have.

Mr. ROONEY. Is that a proposal of General Eisenhower?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not know. I understand the Voice of America is putting it in No. 1 headlines today.

Mr. ROONEY. Would it make any difference to the gentleman whether it was proposed by General Eisenhower?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; it would. If my son goes over there, I want him to fight under the Stars and Stripes and not under some foreign flag. I will say that to the gentleman without any hesitation.

Mr. ROONEY. At first blush I might be inclined to agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] gave quite a dissertation on the need for bringing advertising men into the Voice of America program. He implied that this program would be much better if it had an advertising man in a key position.

Apparently the gentleman from Ohio does not know that the present General Manager of the program, Mr. Thurman L. Barnard, is a top-flight advertising man who, in the past, has handled most of the advertising for the Ford Motor Co. and for the Procter & Gamble Co. He also had psychological-warfare experience during the last war. Mr. Barnard, incidentally, took a salary cut of about 80 percent in order to do this important work.

Incidentally, Mr. Barnard and other top-flight advertising men claim that the amount of money spent on evaluation of the Voice of America program is not too excessive. They point out that it has been proposed to spend only about 3 percent of the total budget of this program for evaluation and that major networks of this country and major radio advertisers spend at least as high a proportion on audience surveys, market research, and other evaluation techniques.

(Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to a combat veteran of the Korean War, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I am disqualified from making any remarks on Voice of America broadcasting.

In Italy I was called to the front to broadcast when bullets failed, just before the Battle of the Bulge. General Clark sent word that he wanted live German prisoners. I was called on, and with the grace of God, by broadcasting to the enemy we got 22, and with some information gleaned thereby we checked a break-through around Christmas time.

I have also made a broadcast on the Voice of America to Poland. I have been there; studied there, and I ask you to study my broadcast. I think it will do a job.

My wife, who was in Warsaw when the bombs fell in 1939 and in Vienna in 1945 when American bombs fell, has also made a Voice of America broadcast. They are available for your inspection.

I was in Korea and it seems to me in discussing the Voice of America that we have started out on the wrong foot. Perhaps the Voice of America talks too much about America, as though this one-hundred-and-seventy-five-some-odd-year-old country can tell people with thousands of years of history and culture what they should do. To that extent I say perhaps we are a little egotistical.

We learned much in Korea. We are not fighting a third-class enemy, as General Wedemeyer would have you believe.

The enemy has shown us cards in spades. We found enough field artillery pieces buried in a river bed, cosmolened, to supply a whole infantry division. We discovered four caves filled with enough demolition to load 67 army trucks. In some caves, cattle was stored. The enemy slept in civilian homes by day and marched by night.

Their propaganda is vicious. They really hate. You have to match them, or else you are going to lose.

Granting everything you say about the Voice of America, that it is in a coffin corner, does that mean that the Voice of America is not opposed to tyranny and that you are going to let it down?

Did you do that to General Walker when he was in a coffin corner on the Pusan perimeter and we went from Kaesong to Taejon to Taegu? When we

Sure, Mr. Republican and Hoover and came out of Hungnam, did you throw in the towel? Not Congress.

Sure, Mr. Republicans and Hoover and Joe Kennedy did. One wonders whether they spoke like fighting Americans or were in Stalin's boat, unwittingly.

When I got back from Korea, my reaction to them was, "No guts." Now, today, they and their followers seem to say, "Go to the Yalu." We need a little consistency.

The Voice of America is cut down to \$85,000,000. There should not be a one of us that wants it cut more. Do you know what six leading American corporations spent in advertising in 1950? Eighty-nine million dollars, or \$4,000,000 more than you are asking the Voice of America to spend.

And what is the income of these six corporations? What is the income of the United States?

The corporations sell products and good will. All we sell is the Bible, the flag, and the Constitution, and what each means. That is America. Our Bible says, "Be kind"; our flag, "Be loyal"; our Constitution, "Be fair." Can you put a price on America? I dare you to.

I say if you tamper with the Voice of America, instead of studying it and giving it help, you will defeat the purpose for which we dedicate our lives, and that is freedom for all the world.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was greatly impressed by what the distinguished gentleman said in regard to the use of foreign-language broadcasts. In a recent visit to Formosa I was informed by the leaders of the Nationalist troops that they would be delighted if they could be



permitted to send those Chinese troops, those loyalist, United Nations Chinese troops to Korea. Those leaders said if they did not carry a single gun they could be most effective by broadcasting to those Chinese Red troops. I want to know if the gentleman does not think we could make effective use of these Chinese allies of ours in the very way he has indicated.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. That is going into foreign affairs. The Voice of America, I dare say, implements foreign affairs. I answer that this way.

If we have patience, perhaps the justification in not going across the Yalu will become evident. The military has set a precedent by limiting its operations to Korea, and not allowing Chinese Nationalist troops to go there.

You are now putting the State Department in position to demand that all diplomatic discussions be limited to Korea.

That means that you are not going to sell out Formosa with its Chinese troops, and you are not going to discuss the admittance of Red China to the United Nations.

If you bring Chiang Kai-shek's troops into Korea, you are going to compromise the strong stand you now have, the ace in the sleeve. If you do not ask Chiang for help, the Reds cannot justifiably bring in any extraneous problem for solution in Korea.

In that sense, I think Marshall and Acheson are right. Perhaps America will yet acclaim their brilliant direction of Korean hostilities and negotiations.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, is it not a breach of comity between the House and the Senate for a Member of this body to attack a Senator by name on the floor of the House?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I apologize.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I hope the gentleman will correct his remarks accordingly.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Against the advice of my colleagues, I might say that when I landed from Korea last December, when our boys were in a coffin corner, hearing a Senator of the United States wanting to throw in the towel on Korea, if I am wrong in saying he lacked guts, I apologize.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, as long as I have been a Member of this body, which has been quite a number of years, I have always tried to have decent respect for the opinions of others. That brings me to an answer, an answer from a State Department official himself, as to what that official thinks of the Voice of America, for which we are asked today to appropriate \$100,000,000 for its continuation.

I do not think anybody wants to cut off the Voice of America immediately, but we do question its methods, its material, and its subjects for broadcasting to the nations of the world the message of this country, in order to influence people abroad to be friends of our country and not our enemies.

I am going to read to the House a report on the very question before us; a report from our Minister to Rome, Italy, a report which he made to the State Department expressing his opinion of the Voice of America broadcasts at least to Italy. It is rather revealing, and comes in sharp contrast to what I have just heard on the floor of the House from the gentleman who just preceded me.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the gentleman mentioned whose report it is?

Mr. DONDERO. I will mention the Minister's name.

Mr. ROONEY. Fine.

Mr. DONDERO. What do the Italian people think of the pamphlet material of the United States Information Service? Here is the answer, in the words of an official of the State Department itself, Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., who is our Minister to Rome: "The average Italian is tired of looking at well-fed and well-clothed Americans." And what does Mr. Thompson prescribe? "Material that is more directly anti-Communist."

Mr. ROONEY. Is this not the same matter that was discussed in detail here on the floor of the House some time ago? Is this not the matter where valid, proper, constructive criticism was used within the Voice of America for the purpose of improving it?

Mr. DONDERO. This report was made this year.

Mr. Chairman, I would rather not yield at this point, as I would like to preserve the continuity of my remarks.

Mr. Thompson's comments are contained in an official report to the State Department in Washington, dated March 7, 1951. He said:

We have received the two pamphlets, *Meet Some Americans* and *A Community in Action*. It is our belief that both these pamphlets are too broad in treatment for use in Italy.

The pamphlet, *Meet Some Americans*, is much too scattered in subject matter and not specific enough in its approach to the Italian scene. It would have been more useful if the various types or groups were treated separately, by occupation, for example; we then might have been able to adapt or treat the material more directly in terms of Italian life and problems. Each story should be complete with a beginning and an end. The present pamphlet is too much a collection of photographs of American faces.

With regard to the second pamphlet, *A Community in Action*, this same objection is immediately apparent. Again the approach was too broad; the pamphlet would have been more effective if examples of community action through a democratic approach were illustrated. To be of use to us, however, these examples should have some meaning and application to Italian life and communities. An American community that solved its own housing problem would be one possibility. Community methods of handling adult education or safety are others that might be applicable. In any event, any pamphlet prepared about life in America should be very specific in its treatment of subject matter and should have some applicability in Italy.

Italian criticism has been directed against some aspects of our media program to the

effect that the average Italian is tired of looking at well-fed and well-clothed Americans. He feels that he knows all about American prosperity and American good living.

In connection with our future program, we are in need of pamphlets or pamphlet material that is more directly anti-Communist. In our attempt to reach the Italian worker, we must tell him of forced labor conditions in the U. S. S. R. and its satellites. We must be able to convince him of the dire consequences to him personally of a Communist take-over in Italy. To do this, we need great quantities of material (in most instances it need only be research or preliminary texts and photographs) telling of the effect of communism on the life, labor conditions, purchasing power, diet, clothing, etc., of workmen in the U. S. S. R. and its satellites.

At this time, the main concern of the average Italian worker is economic security, for which he believes he would be willing to trade much of his civil liberties and freedom. We must convince him that the coming of communism to Italy would not provide him with this economic security nor better his lot. It would only force him to work longer hours at less pay and under labor conditions immeasurably worse than his present ones.

While a continuing propaganda effort should be made to educate the Italian worker to value all civil rights, freedom of opportunity to select his job and other similar rights that affect his economics are the ones to emphasize in the immediate propaganda period ahead.

I want to emphasize that the report I have just read was written by an official of the State Department itself, a man who would be presumed to have a friendly attitude toward another activity of his own department. Yet, Mr. Thompson's opinion of the pamphlet material is that it should be made directly anti-Communist. This criticism goes, I believe, to the heart of the deficiencies of the Voice of America and related activities. The officials of the Voice have no real conception of the enemy they are fighting, and they are therefore completely helpless in mounting the weapons that are required to fight that enemy.

The best way to be anti-Communist is to understand communism—something that has never occurred to officials in the Voice of America. The best way to put the Voice of America on its feet would be to put it in the hands of persons who know the score when it comes to communism. If the present Voice management persists in staying in power, the least it can do is read 5 or 10 out of the hundreds of available books on communism.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the remarks just made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], I shall here insert, under the permission heretofore granted me by the House, what are alleged to be typical broadcasts on the subject *Life Behind the Curtain*. (The matter referred to is as follows:)

#### LIFE BEHIND THE CURTAIN No. 23

REPORTS FROM: RUMANIA, U. S. S. R., BULGARIA, HUNGARY, ALBANIA, POLAND, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, AND SOVIET ZONE OF AUSTRIA

(EDITORS NOTE.—Sources for each item are given in the margins.)

FEPS—Free European Press Service.

FBIS—Foreign Broadcast Information Service.



NYT—New York Times.

CDN—Chicago Daily News.

**ANNOUNCER.** We present now a special feature based on reports reaching the United States from the Soviet Union and its satellites—a brief glimpse at the lives of the men and women under communism. Today, you will hear reports from Rumania, the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet zone of Austria.

**NARRATOR.** Bucharest, Rumania. The Communist government's capital police force has instituted controls for checking on the identity and activities of all citizens in Bucharest which are reported to be even more extreme than the old "police report" methods of the Nazi period. A police decree was recently published requiring all owners of property, housing superintendents, managers of business houses, and sublessors to report within three hours anyone moving into their premises without a police identity card. Punishment for failure to report violators is 1 to 6 months' imprisonment and a fine of five-to-20,000 leis. This fine amounts to 1 to 4 months' pay for the average Rumanian industrial worker.

Moscow, U. S. S. R. Observers in Moscow report that the Communists are having difficulty in getting Soviet youth to respond to their campaign of "peace through belligerency." At a recent Youth-for-Peace rally in Moscow, they said, the young people participated lustily in the singing of love songs and Russian folk songs. But their response to a song about the "instigators of a new war" was noticeably unenthusiastic. Although the song was led by a Communist Youth leader and the words of the propaganda tune were told up before the audience on a large banner, they reported, few of the Moscow young people joined in the singing. Most ignored the music and fell to talking among themselves.

Kharkov, Soviet Ukraine: Life as a professor in a Soviet university is not easy, according to a professor who formerly taught at the University of Kharkov. Former Soviet Prof. Yuri Sherekh, now a voluntary exile in Sweden, told a lecture audience the other day that under the Bolshevik regime scientists and academicians must exercise constant vigilance to assure that they are serving the party's interests. As a result no academician would read a paper or deliver a lecture which did not succeed at some point in unmasking deviationists, however abstract the subject or however far-fetched the connection. A psychologist speaking of the mechanism of aperception is expected to warn his listeners against the crimes and errors of the spiritualists, Professor Sherekh said. An engineer speaking on industrial construction must thunder denunciations against someone who has done a faulty construction job somewhere sometime in the past. Creative scholarship and scientific research are retarded, he said, because professors and scientists are having to look for scapegoats to satisfy the party's constant demand for Socialist vigilance.

Sofia, Bulgaria: The Bulgarian radio's broadcast of August 28 announcing slogans of gratitude for what it described as the Soviet Union's fraternal aid and selfless daily assistance to Bulgaria is reported to have left most Bulgarians cold. Neutral economic observers in Sofia report that the decision of the Kremlin-controlled Communist puppet government to tie Bulgaria's economy to the needs of the Soviet Union has transformed the satellite nation into little more than a colony for Soviet exploitation. As an example, they said, the Soviet Union has forced the Bulgarians to export the bulk of their commodities such as tobacco and rose oil to the U. S. S. R. at cut rates and then has resold them on the world market at a low profit, virtually

eliminating Bulgarian competition. On the other hand it has flooded Bulgarian markets with surplus Soviet goods of inferior quality which the subservient Bulgarian puppet regime has made no effort to prevent. Meanwhile, they said, Bulgaria's ambitious post-war plan for the industrialization and electrification of large areas of the country has been scuttled by the Soviet Union's failure to support the idea. As an evidence of this they pointed to the drastic restrictions which have been imposed on the use of electric power due to the failure of the Soviet Union to send promised power generators and spare parts. Slogans about the Soviet big brother being the sun and air of Bulgaria and Bulgaria's guaranty of independence cannot lessen the clear and present reality that Bulgarians are underpaid, underclothed, underfed, and economically demoralized largely because of Soviet exploitation, they said.

Budapest, Hungary: Newspapermen in the capital cities of Moscow's satellites report that one of the most sensitive parts of the Cominform's machinery for spreading the "big lie" is the Editorial Office for Foreign News. A branch of this office, they report, operates in each of the Communist capitals and exercises a rigid control on all news printed by the captive press. Newsmen familiar with the operations of the EOFN report that these offices receive direct releases from Moscow for distribution to the satellite press, complete with translations of significant articles from the Soviet press. Translations of items from the western press are also provided, but these may only be used after they have already appeared in the Soviet press. No other foreign items are permitted to be printed. The EOFN exercises a rigid scrutiny of the national press to see that this rule is observed.

Valona, Albania: The Soviet Union's high-handed trade tactics with one satellite country are not working out very well. According to reports from Valona on the Adriatic Sea, Russian ships are putting in frequently at Valona and taking on cargoes of crude oil, copper, chrome, timber, leather, meats, cheese, and industrial herbs. The loading is being done at night by troops of Albania's Communist army, and civilians are not allowed near the dock area. This is reportedly due to the widespread unrest caused by the Soviet Union's one-way handling of its present trade agreement with its smallest satellite. Under the terms of a long-standing agreement the Soviet Union had promised to provide Albania with extensive textile machinery, a sugar refinery, an oil refinery, and other equipment, including sufficient oil piping to connect Valona with the oil fields in the Kossovo area. Thus far, it is reported, it has only delivered the oil pipes, which are now being used to drain Albania's oil for transshipment to Russia.

Lublin, Poland: Mention of the Polish National Liberation Committee's famous manifesto issued on the date of the wartime committee's founding on July 22, 1944, was conspicuously absent from the speeches which marked the Communist sixth anniversary celebration at Lublin recently. Loyal Poles recalled that the Soviet-sponsored committee, formed while the European conflict was still going on, promised to promote friendship between Poland and Great Britain and the United States. It also promised to preserve civil liberties "especially freedom of the press, associations, gatherings, professional organizations, and freedom of religion." And it assured that private ownership would be preserved in all walks of life. Polish observers pointed out that the signers of the manifesto are now as obsolete as the manifesto's provisions. Of the 13 who signed it 6 years ago, only 2—Radkiewicz, minister of public security, and Skrzyszewski, minister of education—re-

main in high posts. The others have died, fallen into obscurity, or been placed in minor positions by their Communist bosses.

Prague, Czechoslovakia: Communist music-maker Jaroslav Barwick has completed a cantata based on the Moscow slogan "Hands off Korea." Orchestras and choirs throughout Czechoslovakia have been ordered to learn the cantata and report back to Prague the date of the first performance.

Soviet sector, Vienna, Austria: Austrian officials are worried about attempts by Soviet officers to exert pressure on Austrian law courts. Chancellor Leopold Figl recently submitted evidence of 214 instances covering 25 out of 26 courts in the Soviet occupation zone in which Soviet officers had phoned Austrian judges instructing them on sentences which should be handed down and demanding acquittals for Communists and stiffened sentences for anti-Communists.

**ANNOUNCER.** You have just heard another in our series of on-the-spot reports of life as it is lived in the countries under communism. Tune in regularly on this same meter band for our frequent reports on life behind the curtain.

**Mr. ROONEY.** This broadcast shows how difficult life behind the iron curtain is and how unpopular Communists are. It is a typical broadcast, I have been given to understand, on this subject, having emanated from the Voice of America under date of September 1, 1950.

**Mr. DONDERO.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. ROONEY.** I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

**Mr. DONDERO.** It is my understanding that in the last election in Italy, while they did not gain as many votes in their official body, yet the Communists carried by a larger vote than they did in the preceding election.

**Mr. ROONEY.** May I say this to the gentleman with regard to the Voice of America in Italy. I have been in Italy a half a dozen times in the last 7 years. I have spoken to the highest American officials, to the highest Italian officials. I have spoken to the man in the street. I have spoken to the clergy. It was practically unanimously agreed, all along, since the election troubles with the Communists started in 1946, that the Voice of America contributed heavily to the success of the anti-Communists.

**Mr. JOHNSON.** Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

**Mr. ROONEY.** I gladly yield to the gentleman from California.

**Mr. JOHNSON.** I have been briefed with groups a number of times regarding the unrest in the countries behind the iron curtain. What can the gentleman tell us, if anything, regarding the activity of the Voice of America in stirring up and amplifying that unrest?

**Mr. ROONEY.** I think if the gentleman will read the hearings before this Subcommittee on Appropriations, not only on the pending bill for 1952 regular appropriations, but on the third supplemental appropriation bill, he will find some answer to that question. Most of the testimony, however, has necessarily been off the record.

**Mr. JOHNSON.** May I ask just one further question: Could you give us for the RECORD here any specific instance where it is thought that the activities of



the Voice of America have amplified and increased the unrest?

Mr. ROONEY. The following article from the Washington Star covers one instance:

SEVENTEEN ANTI-RED POLES ESCAPE IRON CURTAIN IN IRON HORSES

BRUSSELS, BELGIUM, April 28.—Broadcasts by the Voice of America and the British Broadcasting Corp. inspired 12 Polish rail workers to flee their Communist homeland in two stolen locomotives and seek refuge in Western Europe, it was learned last night.

With the help of a forged collective passport, the freedom-loving 12 broke through the iron curtain and made a 17-day journey across Germany to Courtrai, Belgium. Not even the Russian border guards in East Germany questioned their credentials.

Five of the escapees have been given asylum in Belgium. The other seven continued on to France.

One of the railroaders, Stanislaw Oles, told newsmen this version of the escape:

Two Belgian-made locomotives broke down and Polish officials ordered them sent to Belgium for repairs. Six good Communists were supposed to take the engines, but the 12 non-conformists steamed off in them instead. And with the help of their forged passport and the connivance of a minor railroad official they made their escape without being questioned.

Oles said he and his friends, several of whom had been threatened with arrest for their opposition to the Red regime, had heard about the free labor organizations of the Western World through Voice of America and BBC broadcasts.

Oles said some 2,500 Polish railroaders are under arrest for antigovernment activity. He added:

"You can imagine how many more are taking part in the anti-Communist underground fight in Poland."

The fact that the Russians spend so much money for jamming the Voice of America is proof of the fact that the output of the Voice of America is very, very damaging to their cause behind the iron curtain and causing unrest. Contrary to what some speaker said earlier today, the cost of jamming the Voice of America exceeds the cost of putting out the Voice of America. The operation is more expensive to the Russians than the Voice of America is to us because it demands the use of their transmitters which are not then in use in behalf of their propaganda against us.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has used 3 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, one of the chief arguments that was used in favor of our shipping grain to India was the alleged propaganda value to the United States and the cause of democracy generally. But there is good reason to believe that on this question, as on dozens of others, the Voice of America has missed the boat completely.

I would like to read excerpts from an Associated Press story from New Delhi in India, that appeared in the New York Times on May 15, 1951. This story said:

United States officials are chagrined at the pro-Soviet feeling engendered here by the shipment of Russian wheat to this nation, announced on the same day that Prime Minister Nehru accepted the terms for much larger United States aid.

The United States had been shipping 100,000 tons of wheat to India each month, and in addition had just voted a relief shipment of 2,000,000 tons. The Russians, on the other hand, sent a trivial 50,000 tons, yet they were reaping all the propaganda benefits. The Associated Press story told exactly where the blame belonged. It said:

The Indian Government and the United States information services have failed to get across to the Indian people that the United States has been doing for a long time on a large scale what the Soviet Union proposes to do on a small scale.

If the State Department's information services are unable to present to the Indian people the elementary facts about a simple matter like our grain shipments, it will never be able to do an acceptable job with more complex matters in other countries. The State Department's propaganda failure in India is typical of many others that are taking place every month. This House ought to make a thoroughgoing investigation of the State Department's failure in India so that something may be done to prevent any more of these fiascos from taking place. The stakes are too high to permit the State Department to continue its endless blundering.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to read at this time a portion of an unsolicited letter which I received from Hon. Richard P. Gale, a former Member of this body. Mr. Gale had made a trip at his own expense over into the area which was referred to by the gentleman from Maryland who just preceded me, which I think has some bearing upon the matter:

Last winter we had quite a trip through southeast Asia and came in touch with the USIS everywhere; I thought they were doing a swell job. The personnel was good and were working with considerable enthusiasm.

In Bombay, Clark and Hartwell looked good—in their reading room there averaged about 550 readers a day and believe me, they were getting a cross section of American literature—from the Saturday Evening Post to Agriculture yearbooks.

In Delhi, Remington in charge of moving-picture shorts was hitting 300,000 Indians a month; he had 300 films in 7 dialects, some of these films were in commercial channels, some were shown before small groups, others by mobile units, 4 of which were operating out of Delhi.

In Jakarta, Hannah was plugging the movie shorts. He also had small-size illustrated throw-away magazines which were doing well.

In Singapore, Henry Laurence, in Ceylon, Tressider were doing much the same type of work.

The reading rooms were covered with pictures of American life, especially the fact that Negroes were a part of our communities.

Walt Disney pictures were the most popular and have a real following throughout the East.

Printed matter is not quite so important because of the extremely high illiteracy.

Our Voice of America was weak because of technicalities and remote broadcasting stations. I am sorry to say that I heard radio Moscow much more clearly and often than I did the Voice. I think we should get going on radio broadcasts. The Indonesians and

Malayans do not have to read or write for this.

In other words, I was very much encouraged with the USIS effort. It should be kept up and intensified.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, people want peace. Every citizen in this country wants peace. I think that it is safe to say that in the hearts and minds of individual citizens of other countries there is a similar yearning for peace.

Grasping this concept better and more quickly than we have here in the United States, Russia has beat us to the peace offensive. She has misled people in other parts of the world into thinking that communism is a peace-loving doctrine; that those who preach communism are honest crusaders for world peace.

Russia's peace offensive has strengthened her position not only behind the iron curtain but also abroad—in Germany, in Asia, and everywhere else where Russia propagandizes her aims and actions.

In the battle to capture the minds of men, Russia is leading the United States. She has not won the battle because this Nation had the foresight to adopt an information program of international broadcasting, exchange students, motion pictures, libraries, and so forth. But being new to the field of propaganda, we have made mistakes. Some of these mistakes have been unavoidable, others have not.

But the important point is that we are not winning the war of ideologies. And if Congress decides to cut back the proposed plans to expand the Voice of America and other information media designed to cope with the present peace offensive that Russia is waging, then the United States is going to lose the cold war by default. I think that this is exactly what the Soviet Union wants. We must not play into their hands; we must take the offensive away from them, and we cannot do this by cutting back funds necessary to achieve our information goals.

Mr. Chairman, I think that every man in Congress will agree that there should be some sort of an information program abroad—that the United States' leadership in the free world would be meaningless unless we campaigned to explain to those of foreign lands what the world threat of communism really is and what we of the free world are doing and must do to check this threat to our freedom and our security.

But many people have raised the question, "What should our message be?" They agree that there should be some sort of propaganda but they are not sure just what kind of propaganda we should use.

I want to call to the attention of every Member of Congress a statement entitled "What Should Our Message Be?" that was written by several leading social scientists in the United States. This heretofore unpublished statement which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 2, 1951, represents one of the clearest, most concise, and constructive analyses of our propaganda problem that has ever been written. I



hope that those Members who say that we should not invest money in ideological warfare, who say that it is useless to wage campaigns of truth, that we should not expand our information media—will read this document. I feel certain that they will gain perspective and feel as rewarded as I did after I studied this statement.

Knowing the importance that this statement can have to our policy makers, I have sent this statement to a number of Government officials including the President and the Secretary of State. Today I received a letter from Assistant Secretary of State Barrett who is in charge of our information programs. I intend to put this letter in the *RECORD* so that you can see just what our State Department is doing to improve our present program.

Mr. Chairman, before I close I want to reiterate my earnest hope that Congress will rally behind our information programs, that we will reinstate the 90 percent cut the Appropriations Committee made in the Voice of America's plans for expansion during the next fiscal year.

This campaign of truth is as important to us and our allies as our entire mobilization program. It is as important as guns and bullets and tanks.

It is vital to our defense.

It is vital to our security.

It is vital to the survival of the entire free world.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the information service of the State Department had on its payroll an average of 5,956 employees during the last fiscal year. For this year the information service submitted a budget calling for 9,883 employees—an increase of almost 100 percent. Despite this huge payroll the information service spent \$1,471,593 last year for the purchase of various kinds of free-lance material, and it requested \$1,502,355 for this year. The amount paid to free-lance writers alone last year was \$443,926.

I can see no possible justification for spending such a sum on outside writing and other material when the information service is already bursting at the seams with 6,000 employees. It is possible that extraordinary situations may arise when an outside writer might have to be retained to produce a highly specialized piece of work that the regular employees could not turn out, but these cases should happen only on very rare occasions. If the 6,000 employees on the information service payrolls are worth their salt, they should be competent enough to handle virtually any task that might come along. The only conclusion to be drawn, therefore, is that the information service's employees have been hired haphazardly and that they are unable to perform the duties of an effective propaganda program.

I am especially concerned about another phase of this free-lance matter. I have studied a long list of the free-lance

writers employed by the International Broadcasting Division during the fiscal year 1951 and I have found the names of several well-known radio commentators. They include Charles Collingwood, who received \$900; William Downs, who received \$100; Griffing Bancroft, who received \$50; and Eric Sevareid, who also received \$50. All four of these men are political commentators in the Washington bureau of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

In hiring these men the State Department, to put it mildly, has placed itself in a highly dubious position. As political commentators they frequently have occasion to pass judgment and express opinions regarding the same State Department that is making cash payments to them. In this regard I should also mention that the Columbia Broadcasting System has the reputation of being, through its so-called news programs and commentaries, a strong supporter of the Truman administration and of socialistic tendencies generally. The Columbia Broadcasting System has been well treated by the Truman administration; it was Columbia's color television system that received the approval of the Federal Communications Commission and is now being adopted as the standard color system for this country. Columbia stands to gain many millions of dollars from this decision. The agency that handed down the decision, the Federal Communications Commission, is, of course, the same agency that holds the power of life and death over radio stations through its licensing requirements.

There is one additional well-known name among the free-lance writers on the payroll of the State Department. He is Ben Grauer, who received \$680 during the last fiscal year. Ben Grauer is a commentator and announcer for the National Broadcasting Co. His commentaries during the televising of the meetings of the United Nations in New York attracted considerable attention for seeming to go out of their way to present the Russian viewpoint in a favorable light.

Mr. Grauer has a lengthy record of affiliation with Communist and Communist-front organizations. According to the House Un-American Activities Committee, he was a sponsor of the Artists' Front To Win the War, which has been cited as a Communist front by the House committee. The *Daily Worker* of June 17, 1946, listed Grauer as a signer of a statement of the Action Committee To Free Spain Now, which has been cited as a Communist front by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

Grauer has been especially active with the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, which has been cited as a Communist front by the California Committee on Un-American Activities. According to the *Daily Worker*, he was one of the sponsors of the organization. He also became a member of the board of directors and a member of the executive committee of the radio division.

To give you some idea of Grauer's close relationship with this so-called Citizens Committee, I will list his connection with some events sponsored by it:

In 1945, he was a speaker at a dinner for Jo Davidson. In 1946, he attended a dinner for United Nations delegates, was a speaker at a Broadway for Mead and Lehman dinner, and was a speaker at a One World or None rally. In 1947, he was the narrator at a show called *The Fashion in Politics*.

Grauer has been a delegate to the New York State convention of the Progressive Citizens of America, which has been cited as a Communist front by the California Committee on Un-American Activities. He was also a sponsor of a dinner of that organization in 1947.

Grauer was a sponsor of a Win the Peace Conference in Washington in 1946. The Attorney General of the United States cited this organization as subversive and Communist on December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

If the State Department persists in buying free-lance material from outside writers, the least it can do is make sure of their background.

Two years ago some small-town Illinois newspaper editors and reporters were castigated from one end of the country to the other for receiving as little as \$8 a week from the State government. In fact, the two newspapermen who dug up the story about their colleagues received a Pulitzer prize. I do not expect to be awarded a Pulitzer prize for my efforts here today but I do hope that the newspapers and radio stations of the country, and particularly the pious breast beaters who shook with rage at the Illinois situation, will permit their blood pressure to rise regarding the State Department payments.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

(Mr. BROWNSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the distinguished gentleman and fellow veteran from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI] could not have remained longer here in the House after making his very inflammatory maiden speech, in which he attacked a Member of the other body, Senator TAFT, because I would like to ask him a question. What are our troops fighting for in Korea, and what were they fighting for in Italy and Germany, if it was not so that a member of any minority in the United States could stand on his two feet and comment honestly on the foreign policy of the United States without being thus censured by rabble-rousing elements of supporters of the majority?

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly about another activity of the State Department, namely, UNESCO.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Federal Relations with International



Organizations of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I believe there is a real place for a well-run, carefully coordinated activity like UNESCO was intended to be.

I do not believe there is any place in the field of international organization for boondoggling, and I am afraid that boondoggling has gone international, and, as usual, it is the American taxpayer who is footing most of the bill. The United Nations Scientific and Cultural Organization, commonly known as UNESCO, is the "fond baby" of the American clique of Caucasian internationalists who presently dominate State Department thinking. I call them Caucasian internationalists because their internationalism stops with their interest in the profitable areas of Europe dominated by the white race.

The State Department's budget request included \$2,785,400 for this year's dues for UNESCO, plus \$209,945 for employees to handle UNESCO matters in the Public Affairs Division of the State Department. This makes a total cost to the American taxpayers of \$2,995,345. For this sum we are entitled to expect UNESCO to function efficiently and accomplish its worthy objectives.

Naturally the United States is paying the largest share of the UNESCO bill. Our proportion is 35 percent—or three times as much as the next largest contributor, Great Britain. What are we getting for this money? A good answer was presented in a story, not from the United States but from a French source, quoted in the Washington Star July 15, 1951, by Marcel Wallenstein. UNESCO, according to a European editor who was quoted in the Star article, is a "crackpot carnival." The Star article also said that UNESCO employees "have the softest jobs in the world, at good pay and tax-free."

I will quote a few other excerpts from the Star article to establish my point that UNESCO, a worthwhile project in itself, is being woefully mismanaged:

The chief beneficiaries of this organization, according to critics in Europe, are the employees. They get fat salaries. They are paid traveling expenses to and from all parts of the world and receive a per diem of \$25 a day. They pay taxes to no government. They get whisky, wine, and cigarettes duty-free and have other diplomatic privileges. \* \* \*

An investigator in Paris wished to find out what the UNESCO staff does to earn a living. This is what he discovered: The organization seriously put forward a plan to take information criticizing any country out of school books throughout the world. \* \* \* It suggested a new Garden of Eden on the Amazon River, the funds to be supplied by members of the United Nations. It studied the case of an African tribe which extracted the front teeth of children so that they could pronounce words of the native dialect.

This is not the UNESCO concept I have supported.

He discovered that Miss Myrna Loy, the Hollywood actress, a member of the organization, was concerned with explaining to the world certain international customs—such as why Englishmen carry umbrellas. \* \* \* UNESCO sent a delegation to study newspapers in Brussels which is said to have

reported three newspapers were published in a city that has none. In the same report it praised what it believed was a newspaper when actually the institution concerned in the report was a lunatic asylum.

The Star article concluded with the case of a retired English politician in France who found it difficult to bring money from England for his living expenses. This man got a job with UNESCO at \$1,500 a month, plus traveling expenses of \$25 a day. He has junketed repeatedly to New York. This summer, wishing to vacation in North Africa, he arranged to receive his traveling expenses from UNESCO. Under unanimous consent, I include the complete Star article at this point:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Sunday Star of July 15, 1951]

#### UNESCO DOINGS CAUSE EUROPEAN GRUMBLING AT "CRACKPOT CARNIVAL"

(By Marcel Wallenstein)

PARIS, July 14.—Men and women who have the softest jobs in the world at good pay—and tax free—are beginning to worry. A fire has been lit under the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which has been meeting here in plenary session.

The British, who pay one-eighth of UNESCO's expenses and the French, who pay less, are beginning to grumble. The United States taxpayer, who pays twice as much as anybody else for what one European editor has called the "crackpot's carnival," seems not to be worried about the drain on his small change.

Next year UNESCO will spend \$8,500,000. Since 1946 it has spent \$34,000,000. What have the nations which have footed the bill obtained for their money? It is doubtful if they have had anything except the information which the UNESCO committee members have sought in many parts of the world.

#### EMPLOYEES GET GOOD PAY

The chief beneficiaries of this organization, according to critics in Europe, are the employees. They get fat salaries. They are paid traveling expenses to and from all parts of the world and receive a per diem of \$25.

They pay taxes to no government. They get whisky, wine, and cigarettes duty free and have other diplomatic privileges.

Investigating the finances of UNESCO recently Viscount Simon, former British Secretary of Foreign Affairs, complained: "They keep books in a haphazard manner."

An investigator in Paris wished to find out what the UNESCO staff does to earn a living. This is what he discovered: The organization seriously put forward a plan to take information criticizing any country out of school-books throughout the world. It supplied cash to numerous strange causes, including a search for mythical Inca treasure. It suggested a new Garden of Eden on the Amazon River, the funds to be supplied by members of the United Nations. It studied the case of an African tribe which extracted the front teeth of children so they could pronounce words of the native dialect.

#### EXPLAINING CUSTOMS

He discovered that Miss Myrna Loy, the Hollywood actress, a member of the organization, was concerned with explaining to the world certain national customs—such as why Englishmen carry umbrellas. John Gordon, editor of the London Sunday Express, who is attacking UNESCO as a useless and wasteful group, suggests Miss Loy explain why Americans chew gum.

UNESCO has sent scientists to many parts of the world to study the causes of war. It has published a report on education and agriculture in remote places in Mexico and

Africa. It sent a delegation to study newspapers in Brussels and is said to have reported three newspapers were published in a city that has none. In the same report it praised what it believed was a newspaper when actually the institution concerned in the report was a lunatic asylum.

The critics list many such cases.

#### HE NOW DRAWS \$1,500 A MONTH

Last year a retired English politician in France found it difficult to bring money from England for his living expenses. He knew officials of the UNESCO and succeeded in having himself nominated to its Paris staff. He draws \$1,500 a month. When he travels he is paid expenses of \$25 a day. He has been repeatedly to New York. Wishing to spend a holiday this summer in North Africa, he applied for and received traveling expenses from UNESCO.

The positions are obtained by nomination by members within the organization. The staff is an international body drawn from most nations which are members of the United Nations. The Director-General is Torres Bodet, a Mexican poet, who draws \$20,000 a year and has a very large expense account and other privileges. Secretaries, messengers, and other minor employees are paid three times the salaries such work normally brings in Europe. All salaries are payable in United States currency.

Another case in point is the recent junket to Paris by Howland H. Sargeant, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Mr. Sargeant was married to Miss Myrna Loy, the movie actress, on June 2, 1951. Five days later they left for Paris, where Mr. Sargeant was chief of the United States delegation at a UNESCO meeting. His bride is a member of the United States National Committee for UNESCO. Mr. and Mrs. Sargeant returned to Washington on July 19.

I admire Mr. Sargeant's choice of Paris as a place to honeymoon. My only regret is that the average American taxpayer is not able to arrange a honeymoon there at the Government's expense. In fact, I think most of the free Government-paid trips to every corner of the globe have become a racket. The formula is merely to get oneself appointed a delegate to some convention or other such as UNESCO. And the way to arrange that is to have the proper "in" at the State Department.

What is the answer to those of us who want an operative and effective UNESCO to replace this mismanaged socialite travel club? We must curtail appropriations for UNESCO until it has cleaned out its own house.

Congress should adopt a bill such as S. 1166 which the Senate passed this week and H. R. 3406, introduced by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. Church] which provides for the creation of a commission to make a study of the administration of all overseas activities of the Government and to make recommendations to the Congress. No nation, however virtuous and powerful, can have the mandate to make the world over in its own image. It is time we surveyed our activities in the current light of reality and abandoned the spongy sentimentalism of the State Department. In promoting and encouraging the present frivolous activities of UNESCO, over the protests of responsible representatives of France and Great Britain, we have again



exhibited that in world affairs there is too much voice of America and not enough ears of America. Let us listen to our allies' warnings and insist that UNESCO be revitalized before we continue appropriations at a level which supports such waste, extravagance, and parasitism.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. ROONEY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, the budget for the State Department's informational activities includes an item of \$630,717 for publishing the Russian-language magazine *Amerika*, which is distributed in Moscow to the Russian people. A few years ago the plan for this magazine was sold to Congress on the basis that the publication would be sold to the Russian people and would be on a self-sustaining basis as far as American taxpayers are concerned. Under an agreement reached with the Russian Government 50,000 copies of each issue of *Amerika* were to be distributed.

Today, according to testimony before the Appropriations Committee, only 22,642 copies are being distributed in Russia because of obstacles put in the way of its sale by the Russian Government. Yet the State Department is continuing to print and ship 50,000 copies, even though it is a foregone conclusion that more than half of them will never reach the Russian people. In other words, the American taxpayers are paying \$630,717 to reach only 22,642 Russians.

I shall not comment on the State Department's failure to make the Russians live up to their agreement—but the State Department's stupidity in continuing to print 50,000 copies of the magazine *Amerika*, when only 22,642 are distributed, is worthy of calling it to the attention of the House. If the State Department could adjust its operations to reality, it would be able to make a substantial cut in its annual cost of operation.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey which were not such as should be uttered in this Chamber.

If we on this side could be convinced that the Voice of America is spreading the words of the Bible, emphasizing the American flag and the Constitution of the United States, we would not object to \$100,000,000 being spent. As a matter of fact, we would want to up it 5 or 10 times that amount.

Why does the State Department continue to throw suspicion on itself? Why, yesterday, in a United Press release, we find that they are protecting the reputation of this man John Patton Davies, Jr., the man who was sent home from China by General Stilwell and General

Hurley because they thought that he was too close to the Communists of China, and yet the State Department has kept that man employed ever since.

In these 2 minutes I think that we should observe, too, the propaganda that is going on in the Chamber. I noted that when the gentleman from New York, [Mr. TABER] made some remarks here relative to the State Department appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] immediately had an answer and he said that the State Department forwarded him copies of everything that they sent to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. On every speech that has been made since, the gentleman from New York, or someone sitting at the committee table, has placed in the RECORD information which they said came from the State Department. There is your propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is grossly misinformed and I am sure he does not want to misrepresent things. Does the gentleman mean to criticize the gentleman from New York for being prepared in this debate? Why, the matter mentioned by the last speaker concerning an article in the Washington Star is stale stuff. I have a file here full of satisfactory answers to the sort of nonsense being passed out here today.

Mr. BUDGE. And each of them, according to the gentleman's own admission, comes from the State Department. There is your propaganda.

Mr. ROONEY. That is not so. Some of the material comes to me from the State Department at my specific request and it is so mentioned as coming from the Department when inserted in the RECORD. The gentleman surely would expect the committee to be prepared to defend its action when we so vigorously and economically cut this bill, reducing the so-called Voice of America item from \$115,000,000 to \$85,000,000. Apparently the gentleman is displeased because we cut it as much as we did and he does not have enough to talk about.

Mr. BUDGE. Will the gentleman answer this question?

Mr. ROONEY. I will, if I can.

Mr. BUDGE. Why does the State Department send the gentleman a copy of everything requested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. ROONEY. Because I demanded it of the State Department, and that is my prerogative as the chairman of this committee. I want to know what's going on. I think that is my responsibility.

Mr. BUDGE. If I ask for something, do they send the gentleman a copy of it, too?

Mr. ROONEY. If it amounted to anything, they would.

Mr. Chairman, I must point out that the mimeographed speech of the gentleman from Idaho with regard to the Russian language magazine *Amerika* is

old stuff. This committee through the gentleman from New York addressing you, recounted that whole story here on the floor of the House last April when we considered the third supplemental 1951 appropriation bill. Not a detail of his speech was disclosed at that time. Every one of the facts in regard thereto were fully considered by this committee in marking up the bill now before you and the substantial cut the committee made was based on a number of instances of mismanagement uncovered by the committee, including the one with regard to the magazine *Amerika*. The gentleman and most of the gentlemen who spoke here today do not seem to understand that they are talking about amounts requested in the department's budget and not the amounts provided in the bill we are debating.

Mr. Chairman, a previous speaker here this afternoon mentioned an article published in the Washington Star with regard to UNESCO. I include in this extension the Department's answer to the charges contained in that article, which I had immediately demanded of the Department when I read it in that newspaper. The Department's analysis follows:

ANALYSIS OF ARTICLE BY MARCEL WALLENSTEIN IN WASHINGTON SUNDAY STAR, JULY 15, 1951, ENTITLED "UNESCO DOINGS CAUSE EUROPEAN GRUMBLING AT 'CRACKPOT CARNIVAL'" DATELINE PARIS, JULY 14

#### BACKGROUND

1. The Marcel Wallenstein article purports to have been written in Paris on July 14, thus giving the impression that it is an analysis and a conclusion based upon the Sixth General Conference of UNESCO which was held in Paris, June 18-July 11. Actually, the piece is based almost entirely upon an article by John Gordon which appeared in the London Sunday Express on July 1.

2. The Gordon article was available to the United States delegation which investigated it while in Paris. It concluded that the piece was biased, not factual in content and that parts were based on certain episodes which took place in UNESCO as long ago as 1946. The leader of the British delegation at the Paris conference, David R. Hardman, member of Parliament and parliamentary secretary to the ministry of education, issued a statement based on the British delegation's investigation of the allegations made by John Gordon. Mr. Hardman charged that Mr. Gordon's article was both misleading and inaccurate, and challenged the Sunday Express to print his reply which contained specific point-by-point refutations of the greater number of John Gordon's allegations. Up to July 11, 1951, the Sunday Express had not printed Mr. Hardman's reply.

3. Although we do not know whether Wallenstein ever went near UNESCO during the Sixth General Conference to do any original investigation or reporting, the following facts are clear:

(a) Wallenstein derives most of his material, usually without identifying his source, direct from the John Gordon article of July 1 in the Sunday Express;

(b) Wallenstein at no time consulted the chairman of the United States delegation at Paris, or, so far as can be ascertained, any other member of the United States delegation;

(c) Many of his statements are not only completely inaccurate, but could have been demonstrated to be false if Wallenstein had made the slightest effort to check the facts.

These are important considerations because the original Gordon article makes no pre-



tense at having sounded out opinions prevalent in Paris or in Europe—whereas the Wallenstein piece, derived almost entirely from the Gordon column, is carried under the headline, "UNESCO doings cause European grumbling \* \* \*" and conveys the misleading impression that Wallenstein is reflecting a wide range of European opinion.

4. Since Wallenstein had added an original inaccuracy, namely, that "The United States taxpayer seems not to be worried about the drain on his small change," it is important to note, that so far as can be ascertained, Wallenstein never approached any member of the United States delegation to ascertain the opinions or the actions being taken by the delegation. As noted below, the United States delegation took firm actions in a constructive spirit on many matters relating to the budget and the scale of contributions. In fact, the United States delegation led a vigorous fight to keep the 1952 UNESCO budget down to the current level of activity, and successfully waged a campaign to reduce the United States contribution to UNESCO from 35 percent to 33½ percent.

5. Each of the 56 delegations present at the conference was an official delegation of its government. The members of the United States delegation heard no grumbling among this official group of the kind mentioned by Wallenstein.

#### ANALYSIS

First paragraph: "Men and women who have the softest jobs in the world at good pay—and tax free—are beginning to worry. A fire has been lit under the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, which has been meeting here in plenary session."

The facts: Pay received by employees of UNESCO is in line with that received by employees of the UN and the other specialized agencies. The conference did not attack the wages paid employees nor the size of the Secretariat. There was no indictment of the manner in which the employees have been carrying out the program.

Second paragraph: "The British, who pay one-eighth of UNESCO's expenses, and the French, who pay less, are beginning to grumble. The United States taxpayer, who pays twice as much as anybody else for what one European editor has called the crackpot's carnival, seems not to be worried about the drain on his small change."

The facts: The British and the French voted at the general conference in favor of an increase in UNESCO's budget to \$8,700,000. The United States and two other nations voted against this proposal. The United States delegation argued strongly that a lower budget of \$8,500,000 would be sufficient to enable UNESCO to carry out its programs in 1952 at the same level as this year, even taking into account increased costs due to price rises. In addition, a vigorous and effective presentation by the congressional adviser acting as spokesman for the United States delegation resulted in a decision by the general conference to reduce the United States percentage of contribution from 35 percent to 33½ percent.

Third paragraph: "Next year UNESCO will spend \$8,500,000. Since 1946 it has spent \$34,000,000. What have the nations which have footed the bill obtained for their money? It is doubtful if they have had anything except the information which the UNESCO committee members have sought in many parts of the world."

The facts: Although UNESCO's job is in many respects a long-term one—just as is the task of the schools and educational systems of the United States and other countries—UNESCO's work has provided many practical and immediate benefits to its member states during the first 5 years of its existence.

Some examples: UNESCO established and administered a book coupon plan which has permitted the exchange of over \$1,000,000 worth of books, films, and scientific equipment among the nations of the world, and which cut through the red tape and difficulties of currency restrictions and differences. The books were largely medical books going to countries which had been unable to obtain such works since before the war. The United States has benefited directly as the largest seller of these books. In the United States the book coupon transactions have been handled by the American Booksellers Association.

UNESCO has assisted in raising millions of dollars for the reconstruction of the educational institutions of war-devastated areas. It published a Book of Needs which advised nations in a position to give of the needs of the devastated areas. It assisted materially in the reconstruction of the ruined schools and libraries in many of the war-torn countries of Europe. For example, voluntary groups in the United States contributed \$25,000,000 for educational reconstruction in 1950 alone—three times the amount of the entire UNESCO annual budget.

UNESCO has established a center in Mexico which is training teachers of many of the Latin-American countries in methods of fundamental education. This same center is producing teaching materials which will be used throughout Latin America in a concerted effort of fundamental education to reduce illiteracy throughout the area—an essential for laying the ground work for improved standards of living and of health.

UNESCO has sent educational experts to some of the newly independent countries of the world to advise them on methods of establishing educational systems. Missions have gone to Burma, Afghanistan, Thailand, and the Philippines, and results of their work are already being reflected throughout the schools in those countries.

UNESCO has established field science cooperation stations in New Delhi, Manila, Cairo, and Montevideo, to make available to those less-developed areas of the world the scientific information necessary for their economic development.

Fourth paragraph: "The chief beneficiaries of this organization, according to critics in Europe, are the employees. They get fat salaries. They are paid traveling expenses to and from all parts of the world and receive a per diem of \$25 a day. They pay taxes to no government. They get whisky, wine, and cigarettes duty free and have other diplomatic privileges."

The facts: UNESCO salaries are not "fat." In fact it has been the experience that it is often difficult or impossible to recruit competent employees in the United States because the salaries for certain types of work are inadequate by United States standards.

Per diem pay by UNESCO is as follows: The Director General and the Deputy Director General, \$20; department heads, \$15; high level staff members, \$12.50; all others, \$10. The average per diem paid to persons on UNESCO missions is \$12.50. This amount includes all expenses of the employees, including hotels, taxis, and incidentals.

Taxes on the salaries of UNESCO employees are paid by the Organization to any nation which levies such taxes. This is necessary in an international organization in order to equalize the salaries of the employees in the same classifications. If this were not done, employees doing the same work would receive substantially different net pay, depending on the tax assessed by their countries.

The privilege of duty-free articles does not extend to any employee outside the immediate office of the Director General.

Fifth paragraph: "Investigating the finances of UNESCO recently Viscount Simon,

former British Secretary of Foreign Affairs, complained: 'They keep books in a haphazard manner'."

The facts: This statement is completely misleading. It refers to a condition in UNESCO in 1946 which was promptly corrected by the Executive Board and the Director General.

The internationally-known firm of Price, Waterhouse & Co. audited UNESCO's accounts in 1948 and 1949, and the Comptroller and Auditor General of Great Britain audited the accounts for the financial year 1950.

This is the statement made by Price, Waterhouse: "So far as was disclosed by our tests of detailed operations and by inquiries we have made, money has not been obligated or expended for purposes other than those for which the appropriations voted by the general conference were intended to provide except so far as the Director General and the Executive Board have authorized transfer within the budget, and the expenditure conforms to the authority which governs it."

This is the statement made by the Auditor General of Great Britain, whose audit is in accordance with the United Nations plan of establishing a joint panel of public auditors for the purpose of auditing the accounts of the United Nations and the specialized agencies:

"1. Report of the auditors on the accounts for the financial year 1950: (A) Sir Ronald Adam (Chairman of the Finance Committee of the Executive Board) introduced the reports of the Director-General and the External Auditor on the accounts of the organization for the year ended December 31, 1950 (Doc. 6C/ADM/2 and addendum). He expressed the conviction of the executive board that the accounts were in good order. The External Auditor, Sir Frank Tribe, made a brief statement on the scope of his audit and reported that the financial accounts of the organization were in order."

Sixth paragraph: "An investigator in Paris wished to find out what the UNESCO staff does to earn a living."

The facts: This may refer to Mr. John Gordon. It would have been possible to estimate UNESCO activities from three convenient sources: The report of the Director General, the reports of member states, and the draft program for 1952 which was being considered by the conference when the Gordon article was published in London. This could have been supplemented by interviews and by attendance at the public sessions of the various commissions which were considering budgets, program, and administration.

While it is almost impossible to identify precisely those activities which Wallenstein chose to extract from the Gordon piece, the intent appears to be to hold these activities up to ridicule.

Sixth paragraph (continued): "The organization seriously put forward a plan to take information criticizing any country out of schoolbooks throughout the world."

The facts: This must refer to the constructive efforts being made for the improvement of textbooks, a step applauded by educators in many countries. Part of this is an effort to eliminate nationalist bias, especially in textbooks. Generally, the approach is toward an improvement in teaching materials, for example, in geography and history. Forty-six representatives from twenty-four countries attended a seminar in Brussels in 1950 on the improvement of history books. As a first result of the seminar, several Belgian publishers have declared themselves willing to apply certain of the suggestions put forward. Arrangements are being made to set up nine schemes for bilateral textbook exchange and criticism. Five member states have undertaken a systematic survey of their school textbooks from the standpoint of their bearing on international understanding.



Sixth paragraph (continued): "It supplied cash to numerous strange causes including a search for mythical Inca treasure. It suggested a new Garden of Eden on the Amazon River."

The facts: It is evident that Mr. Wallenstein had no knowledge of these matters himself and that he lifted these two errors from the John Gordon article.

UNESCO has never contributed a dime to a search for mythical Inca treasure. UNESCO has never suggested a new garden of Eden or any other garden on the Amazon River.

These two misstatements of fact undoubtedly refer to UNESCO's efforts to bring about a study of the untapped resources and possibilities for development of the vast wooded area known as the Hylean Amazon.

It is the contention of many scientists that this is a region of great resources and that a concerted effort would reveal new sources of important strategic raw materials and provide the answer to some of the population pressures in other areas of the world.

To get such a study under way, the first session of the general conference of UNESCO in 1946 approved the establishment of an international institute of the Hylean Amazon in which Brazil, Colombia, Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela would cooperate.

UNESCO did not plan to finance or operate such an institute, but it has offered assistance to the countries involved in finding the technical experts to carry out the work of the institute, and has provided a limited grant in order to enable the institute to be organized.

Sixth paragraph (continued): "It studied the case of an African tribe which extracted the front teeth of children so they could pronounce words of the native dialect."

The facts: Evidently Wallenstein is trying to ridicule one of UNESCO's fundamental educational missions. In some areas where UNESCO carries out campaigns against illiteracy both a native language and a secondary language are used. In teaching the elements of reading and writing, public health, improvement in agricultural methods, etc., UNESCO encourages the use of native languages in order that a larger percentage of the population can be reached.

Wallenstein deliberately tries to mislead his readers as to the purpose of UNESCO's fundamental education efforts.

Seventh paragraph: "He discovered that Miss Myrna Loy, the Hollywood actress, a member of the organization, was concerned with explaining to the world certain national customs—such as why Englishmen carry umbrellas. John Gordon, editor of the London Sunday Express, who is attacking UNESCO as a useless and wasteful group, suggests Miss Loy explain why Americans chew gum."

The facts: Whether or not the reference to Miss Loy is correct as stated, the process of explaining national customs is a legitimate enterprise. Miss Loy is a member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO and has been active in a voluntary capacity.

Eighth paragraph: "UNESCO has sent scientists to many parts of the world to study the causes of war. It has published a report on education and agriculture in remote places in Mexico and Africa. It sent a delegation to study newspapers in Brussels and is said to have reported three newspapers were published in a city that has none. In the same report it praised what it believed was a newspaper when actually the institution concerned in the report was a lunatic asylum."

The facts: (a) In a limited way, inquiries have been carried out into social tensions. For example, there is an important India-UNESCO tensions project which is making important findings and which is, at the same time, laying the basis for the development

of social-science studies in India. (Full details can be supplied on this group of activities.)

(b) While the precise reports referred to have not been identified on agriculture in Mexico and Africa, UNESCO has been praised for its share of the technical assistance work which is also related to the fundamental education campaigns in agricultural and other areas.

(c) In 1947 UNESCO undertook surveys of the needs of the press, the radio, and the film in a number of war-devastated countries. Thus far 61 countries and territories have been studied. In 1950 UNESCO published the first single-volume survey ever prepared of such facilities under the title "World Communications: Press, Radio, Film." These surveys have been concerned both with material factors and with the professional training of journalists and technicians. These surveys have been widely used. We are not able to identify the factual errors reported by Wallenstein.

Ninth paragraph: "Last year a retired English politician in France found it difficult to bring money from England for his living expenses. He knew officials of the UNESCO and succeeded in having himself nominated to its Paris staff. He draws \$1,500 a month. When he travels he is paid expenses of \$25 a day. He has been repeatedly to New York. Wishing to spend a holiday this summer in North Africa, he applied for and received traveling expenses from UNESCO."

The facts: This is poppycock. The Director General of UNESCO is the only employee of the organization who has a salary of \$1,500 a month. Except for the Director General and his deputy, the highest salary paid in UNESCO is \$11,000 per year. These salaries are fixed and no exception may be made. The only other type of employment is that of highly qualified consultants or experts who may be employed on a short-term basis under fee or contract. As noted above, no employee, including the Director General, receives \$25 per diem, and only the Director General or his deputy receive above \$15.

Tenth paragraph: "The positions are obtained by nomination by members within the organization. The staff is an international body drawn from most nations which are members of the United Nations. The Director General is Torres Bodet, a Mexican poet, who draws \$20,000 a year and has a very large expense account and other privileges. Secretaries, messengers, and other minor employees are paid three times the salaries such work normally brings in Europe. All salaries are payable in United States currency."

The facts: UNESCO recruits through member states, national commissions for UNESCO, and qualified organizations and experts in the field of competence desired.

Torres Bodet, in addition to being a scholar and a man of letters, was formerly Minister of Education and Foreign Minister of Mexico. His salary is \$18,000 a year.

Since January 1, 1951, secretaries, messengers, and other minor employees are hired locally at prevailing local rates under the new local salary schedule adopted by the organization.

All salaries at the headquarters in Paris are paid in French francs, with permission for a limited proportion of the salary to be paid in the currency of the employee's home country, as provided in regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following those of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I am sure that the former Member of this body, the Honorable Richard P. Gale from Minnesota is going to be quite shocked when he learns that the remarks which I put in the RECORD were instigated by the State Department. Mr. Gale is an able, experienced man and is not a stooge of the State Department. It is merely a matter of his being over in Asia seeing it firsthand on a trip that he took through that area and submitting to me unsolicited information, feeling that it was in the interest of the United States, like the good American he is, he sent the information to me.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Gale was on a trip at his own expense, is that right?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the private power interests of America cannot escape a major share of responsibility for the appalling disaster in the flood-stricken areas of Kansas and Missouri. And every American Congress in recent years must accept a share of that responsibility, together with a number of State governments and a large segment of the American press.

The private power interests, through their lobbying organizations, have successfully opposed every effort to enact legislation for an adequate flood-control program in the Missouri River Basin, such as was proposed by President Franklin Roosevelt.

The obstructive tactics of the private power lobby were supported by a number of State governments on the pretext of opposition to Federal authority over flood control, and by many newspapers which receive large advertising contracts from the power companies. It is an ironical fact that the power companies make the American people pay for these advertisements in their bills for electricity. This is a practice which the late United States Senator Hiram Johnson once described as "picking the people's pockets to poison their minds."

Instead of adopting President Roosevelt's recommendation for a Missouri Valley Authority similar to TVA, Congress in 1944 approved a weak substitute known as the Pick-Sloan plan, which is subject to no central planning authority and has made little progress. During the past few days the Chief of Army En-



gineers told a congressional committee that the construction of additional dams at a cost of \$300,000,000 could have averted last week's disaster, which has caused property damage estimated at more than a billion dollars.

I freely admit that there is little to be gained in an hour of disaster by trying to place blame upon any individual or group of individuals. Blame cannot repair damage nor cure the wounds of disaster. The only worth-while thing that Congress can do now is to proceed forthwith to establish and finance an efficient control authority in the Missouri Valley which will prevent any recurrence of such flood catastrophes in the future. Similar authorities should be established in every hazardous flood area in the country.

A large part of the cost of these projects would eventually be repaid from the proceeds of the sale of the hydroelectric power developed and from the sale of water for irrigation purposes. Every properly conceived flood-control project can be at least partly self-liquidating, and enormous benefits to the American people and the national economy can be accomplished without any important cost to the taxpayers. It is up to this Congress to act now, and it is up to the American people to observe and remember what we do in this vitally important matter.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, how many voices speak for America?

How many international information and education programs and propaganda machines do we operate within our Government?

How many foreign public relations offices and publicity men do we maintain abroad?

How many Federal agencies have international programs underway?

It would take another Hoover commission to ferret out the complete picture of confusion and duplication that exists in these overlapping activities. Just by going through the budget I found a multitude of overlapping international programs, each with a voice in international affairs and each claiming to speak for its segment of American activity. Let me give you a few illustrations of duplications that I found.

The Department of Agriculture has an office of foreign agriculture relations. I suppose it is the voice of the American farmer.

The Federal Security Agency is expanding its international health program so it can more efficiently compete with the point 4 program and UNESCO. I suppose it wants to be the voice of American medicine.

The North Atlantic Treaty organization has its publicity bureau.

The Army, the Navy, the Air Corps and the Marine Corps all have their foreign press bureaus.

ECA has its far-flung technical assistance and information programs scattered the world over.

The State Department, Maritime Commission, Defense Department, and

ECA each have their student and/or persons exchange program—a sort of glorified free travel agency—all under the name of education, information, or technical assistance programs.

Each of these—and I am sure that investigation would find many others—claim to be voices in the international picture.

There once was a time when the career men in our diplomatic corps and consular service were the ones who were charged with the duty of promoting the foreign policy of the United States. But that was back in the days when we had a foreign policy to promote. Now that we have no foreign policy—and I think that you will agree that is the basic trouble with our State Department today—we find that the State Department now has to compete with and try to outshout the many other Federal agencies whose voices are also crying out of the Washington wilderness. To do so the State Department depends on its gigantic bureau of international information and educational activities. This is the department that produces motion pictures, prepares press features, photo displays, publishes magazines such as *Amerika*, issues daily news bulletins and semi-weekly newsletters, operates a library, conducts scientific and technical programs, and, of course, operates the world-wide radio network which is known as the Voice of America. It has 142 USIE missions abroad—employing 574 American and 2,200 local employees, operating in 86 countries. It is for this bureau that the State Department requests \$115,000,000 to operate in 1952.

But the USIE is not the only State Department agency with international programs, for within the Department there is also the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. It, too, has a program of slanted information for the American Republics. It, too, offers technical cooperation in the fields of public health, agriculture, and education. Then there is the German-Austrian information program, separate and distinct from USIE.

The State Department also has what it calls Missions to International Organizations. These missions, says the State Department, "insure effective participation and presentation of United States viewpoints."

In addition, the United States, through the Department of State, contributes money and support to about 30 international organizations, ranging from UNESCO to the International Whaling Commission.

I wonder how many other bureaus or Federal agencies there are purporting to speak for America.

This is hardly the way to present a picture to the world of a clear-thinking America that is supposed to know exactly where it is going. No wonder the world thinks we are confused.

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, the United States is undoubtedly the

most thoroughly reported country in the world. Thousands of newspapers and magazines report in great detail every conceivable phase of American life. There are approximately 2,000 daily newspapers in the United States, 10,000 weeklies, I am informed, and 7,500 magazines. Among the magazines are *Life*, *Look*, and many others that specialize in photo stories. We also have the three great photo services connected with the Associated Press, International News Photos, Acme, and several smaller agencies.

I have said that to emphasize an important matter in connection with this bill virtually all of the material produced by these organizations is available to the Department of State for reprinting in its publications. Yet our State Department has 10 writer-photographers who constantly travel around the United States, duplicating the work of these publications. The travel cost alone of these 10 men comes to \$36,900 a year. Last year the average American paid \$301 in taxes to the Federal Government. So it took the taxes of 123 persons just to meet the travel expenses of these writer-photographers for the Department of State. The American people are getting fed up with back-breaking taxes. Here is one place we could save.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, all of the several activities of the public-affairs part of the State Department are carried on to implement Public Law 402 of the Eightieth Congress—that is, The United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, commonly known as the Smith-Mundt Act.

Section 402 authorized the Department to provide for the interchange of books and periodicals, for the translation of books and periodicals, and for the preparation, distribution, and interchange of other educational material. It would be foolishly uneconomical for the Government to maintain on its permanent staff all the thousands of specialists required to do one or another of the vast number of subjects and disciplines dealt with. Much of this material, therefore, is bought on contract from private suppliers.

Section 502 enjoins the Department from claiming a monopoly in any medium of information. Heaven knows that the Department cannot claim such a monopoly, not even in the field of short-wave international broadcasting.

Section 601-602 provides for the establishment of two advisory commissions, one for the information and one for the educational exchanges programs. The membership of these commissions, and the various subcommittees, consist of eminent citizens who serve without pay. These commissions report and advise the Secretary of State every 3 months and the Congress every 6 months. The Congress is therefore informed by eminent men who are not creatures of the Department on the content and conduct of the several programs. These men advise those responsible for conducting the program. Their findings, and advice are matters of public record, as well as the action taken by the Department to implement the ad-



vice of the commissions. Section 801 of the act authorizes the Secretary of State to, among other things, make grants of money to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries if doing so will promote the basic objectives of the act. Section 1008 stipulates that the Secretary shall submit to the Congress semiannual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under authority of this act, inclusive of appraisals and measurements, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs in each country where conducted.

The funds expended by contract or by purchase order referred to in the series of articles in the Times-Herald and the Chicago Tribune are expended to meet the requirements of these two sections. The appraisals and evaluations required by the Congress and by good management are done on contract by individuals and organizations preeminently fitted and qualified to do so. The fact that they are done by reputable organizations like Columbia, Harvard, Princeton, and Rutgers Universities, and by public opinion research organizations like Gallup, Wilson, and Roper provides a greater measure of objectivity than if they were conducted by the very persons who are conducting the programs themselves.

The suggestion that the moneys spent for free-lance writers constitute some form of illicit bribe is a lot of nonsense. "Free lance" here is merely a bit of information jargon meaning moneys spent to obtain materials on contract or by purchase order. This amount of money spent judiciously in obtaining articles from persons specially qualified in a particular field or discipline is actually an efficient and economical way to get the most for the taxpayers' dollar. It would require an unconscionably large permanent staff to cover all the myriads of special fields. By using so-called free-lance writers the Government can get the very best kind of writing done on a particular special subject for the least amount of money.

Furthermore, section 1005 of the act specifically states that in carrying out the provisions of this act, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State, to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, including existing American press, publishing, radio, and motion-picture agencies, and so forth.

Services of writers who are not full-time employees of the Department are obtained in accordance with section 4, 302 C, Public Law 152, professional categories. This, of course, applies to the expenditures for so-called free-lance writers. Larger contracts for services and facilities are let through the standard contract regulations of the General Services Administration. The products of the writers are always available to the public and the Members of the Congress as is specified in Public Law 402. The expenditures are reported to the Congress in the Secretary's semiannual report; they are reported in a general way in the reports of the advisory commis-

sions; and they are further dealt with in the various stages of the budget presentation process. The General Accounting Office in its good time reviews all payments made.

In regard to the third article in the Chicago Tribune series in which the Department is alleged to have "concealed" the contracts or is said to have been "nicked," one must note that the figures given are probably correct. These figures were supplied to the appropriate committees of the House and the Senate. The whole impressive list of figures is simply what the Department has spent to obtain the necessary services, materials, and technical professional advice for conducting its radio operations. The various categories of items ranging from electronics equipment to promotion through advertising of the VOA programs are the very kinds of expenditures that any radio operation, private or public, has to make to carry on its operations.

In conclusion, it is difficult to understand how the gentlemen of the Chicago Tribune or the Times-Herald can believe they have discovered or uncovered anything startling when the whole business is virtually conducted in a glass bowl with very clean clear glass in the bowl.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VAN PELT].

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Chairman, the constituents in my district are duly alarmed over the last tax bill that was passed by the House. In their opinion it has reached the point of confiscation. I again call your attention to the figures that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] placed in the RECORD yesterday in that fine statement of his calling attention to the appropriations for the Department of State since 1942. In 1942 the appropriation for the Department of State was \$37,433,599. The request for 1952 is \$283,566,476. The people in my district are also alarmed over the large number of employees that have been hired by these various departments that make up the State Department, and justly so. They are duly alarmed over the type and character of some of these individuals and the lack of morality in our Government.

Many Americans were shocked recently to read of the appointment of Raymond Gram Swing as an adviser and special political commentator for the Voice of America. Once again, the Voice hired one of the most unsuitable persons it could find.

An article in the Freeman magazine by William Henry Chamberlin says of this appointment:

An adviser should presumably be a man who had displayed special insight and foresight, who had criticized, or at least not endorsed, our costly past blunders.

But Raymond Gram Swing was a passionate advocate of many of them. He repeatedly stated in broadcasts, speeches and articles that our troubles with Russia were due to unreasonable distrust of Stalin. He endorsed the so-called Curzon line frontier for Poland. He crowed enthusiastically over Yalta. At least as late as 1949, he seemed more concerned over cartels in the Ruhr than over the Cominform as a threat to

peace and freedom. A worst choice, and one more calculated to confirm the suspicion that something is radically wrong with State Department judgment, could hardly be imagined. It is comparable to making Owen Lattimore adviser on Far-Eastern policy, and J. Alvarez del Vayo on European.

I have studied the text of Mr. Swing's first commentary on the Voice of America, delivered on June 25, 1951, and I have found that all of Mr. Chamberlin's remarks regarding him are more than justified. For instance, speaking of cease-fire negotiations in Korea, Swing said:

It should be noted that the United States vote on the cease-fire resolution in the United Nations on January 13 is not necessarily a statement of present United States policy. In that resolution a broad negotiation for the far eastern settlement was provided which would deal with the membership of Chinese Communists in the United Nations and the future of Formosa. These terms, transmitted to China, were rejected by Chou En-Lai, who insisted on negotiating first a cease fire only when agreement was reached. Before the MacArthur hearings Secretary Acheson recently declined to endorse these terms and said the United States delegation had voted for the resolutions only because we were sure that Peiping would reject them.

In that paragraph Swing was advertising to the world the insincerity and double-dealing of his own State Department. Of course, Swing was attempting to justify Acheson's actions, but the fact sticks out that the United States is placed in the worst possible light before the world. If that is the best Mr. Swing can do, he ought to resign.

In bringing these facts before the committee it is not my intention to deal with personalities but rather to discuss principles.

(Mr. VAN PELT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] with regard to travel expenses for writer-photographers. Apparently he, or whoever it was that wrote the speech, lifted that material right out of the committee hearings. All the speeches we have heard here today concern themselves with the very matters that this committee criticized in the operations and budget of the Voice of America. It was for such reasons that this committee cut the Voice of America appropriations by \$30,000,000. We can assign a reason for every dollar of this cut which is something the minority speechmakers, excluding members of this committee, cannot do.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS].

(Mr. HILLINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, much has been said today and in the course of the debate yesterday concerning the



Voice of America. I think all of us are agreed that the Voice of America can do a tremendous job in fighting communism and in trying to sell the principles of democracy and freedom to the world. I am particularly interested in this program, so much so that at my own expense I traveled to New York not so long ago to tour the Voice of America studios. I also attended some of the Voice of America demonstrations conducted here in Washington by the Department of State.

I have talked with numerous travelers who have been to Europe and Asia in recent months to ask them what reaction they found to the operations of the Voice of America. On the basis of my own investigation I became convinced that the Voice of America is not doing an adequate, decent job in the project assigned to it. I only hope that in the course of this debate we can help outline some of the things wrong with the Voice of America, and make some suggestions as to how it might be able to improve, so that it can do the job expected of it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from California yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I would be glad to yield but I have only a short time.

Mr. ROONEY. I shall be glad to yield the gentleman one additional minute. The gentleman has made the most sensible remarks and taken the most sensible approach to this problem of the Voice of America mentioned here today. While I do not agree with him in his too drastic description of the failures of the Voice of America, he at least constructively criticizes their operations, unlike his colleagues on that side of the aisle, who would cure the patient's sore throat by cutting the patient's head off. Those gentlemen are just against having any kind of a program such as the Voice of America. I commend the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. I thank the gentleman, but I say to the gentleman in response to that, in listening to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], yesterday that he shares the gentleman's viewpoint, that the Voice of America is essential. I think most of my colleagues on this side have that feeling, but it is important that if we are going to appropriate \$85,000,000 for the Voice of America, we must have a good product in return for that money. We must constructively criticize in order to get the right kind of product.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will yield further, would not the gentleman say that constructive criticism of your committee is indicated in the cut from \$115,000,000 to \$85,000,000?

Mr. HILLINGS. I would think that is a pretty strong expression of criticism of the Voice of America. I think that in any event whenever we are faced with this kind of problem, it is the power and prerogative of the Congress, by virtue of control over appropriations, to express that criticism.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. I yield the gentleman one additional minute, Mr. Chairman.

May I pursue one question further with the gentleman? Would not the gentleman say that to reduce the expenditures for the Voice of America beyond the amount of the drastic cut to \$85,000,000 would be foolhardy at this time, with the world situation as it is?

Mr. HILLINGS. Of course, I am not as familiar with the details of the operations and expenses of this agency as would be the gentleman and other members of the Committee on Appropriations. I am sure the other members of the committee will advance some suggestions in that regard during the course of the debate. But if the Voice of America is not doing a good job, we should not continue appropriating large sums of money for its operation which may be wasted.

One of the best criticisms of the Voice of America that I have seen was printed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch last September 5. I need hardly remind the House that this paper is generally friendly to the State Department. The story was written in Manila by Albert Ravenholt. He said that if United States propaganda aims are to be achieved "we will need to scrap many of our present ideas and revise our methods. The mere appropriation of more funds is not enough."

He went on:

It will be necessary to eliminate some of the fuzzy thinking that now handicaps American information efforts. One of these mistaken ideas is the often unconscious assumption that what works in the United States and Europe will work in Asia—at least, if it is translated into the native language. A lack of realism is sometimes evident in Voice programs beamed to China. Chinese who often fear they may be penalized for listening are rarely interested in long descriptions of life in the United States. They want to know what is happening in the world, particularly as it affects them. They want news about other parts of Asia, about the United Nations and American actions concerning China.

After that, they would like to hear about ideas they can put to work in their own lives, including suggestions on health and food and news of progress in the various professions.

Recently a well-informed Chinese came out of Hong Kong from north China. He listed the following as some objections of Chinese listeners to the Voice.

1. The announcer did not speak well the Mandarin dialect.

2. Programs in the Chinese language were delivered in a drab and uninteresting style.

3. The content of programs was only in part related to the immediate interests of the persons to whom it was directed.

As a contrast, the Communist-run Peking radio broadcasts usually are delivered dramatically by female announcers who speak the colloquial tongue.

Probably only a drastic decentralization of Voice operations will enable them to implement a successful program in China or elsewhere in Asia. Anyone working in New York is so far removed from the actual conditions of life in China that the programs he produces are bound to sound phony.

If the studios producing Voice programs for Asia were in this part of the world it would at least be possible for the staff once in a while to get a smell of the rice paddies.

It was less than a year ago that the Voice officials came to the House Appropriations Committee and requested \$7,-

000,000 to purchase as their headquarters the building containing Sherry's Restaurant, across Park Avenue from the Waldorf-Astoria, in New York City. That apparently is the State Department's idea of how to get close to the rice paddies.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, probably the most controversial subject matter in the pending bill, is the item of International Information and Educational Activities, which includes the Voice of America and related propaganda activities.

Our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has yesterday, and on other occasions, given constructive criticism of the efficiency of that service, and in that I wish to join him wholeheartedly.

I have made an attempt to learn more of the workings of that organization and have even participated in several broadcasts to Poland and its people.

I have come to the conclusion that the people at the head of this service have not fully understood their mission. That mission, in my opinion, is not necessarily to convince those victims of Soviet aggression what a wonderful country and system we have in the United States. That is not what they are waiting to hear. What they want to know and what they have been waiting for in vain, is to learn from us what hope there is for them for eventual liberation from the shackles of tyranny and oppression. It is of little comfort to them to learn of the fine conditions existing here in the United States, as long as they have a feeling that there is no possibility that their own plight will be improved.

The failure of our Voice of America to give these enslaved people, our most important future allies, any ray of hope is, in my opinion, a most tragic error of our foreign program. Add to that the irresponsible statements of some of our ambassadors, and you can understand the reasons why our foreign propaganda is not as successful as it could be.

And in this, we need not lay all the blame on the Voice of America, nor on those in charge of the program. Neither of the major parties has yet clearly expressed its policy and objective to be the restoration of freedom to the enslaved people behind the iron curtain. We speak of an understanding on the basis of stopping any future aggression, but we are not prepared or willing to assert a demand for the liberation of those already caught in the brutal net of oppression and tyranny through no fault of their own. How, then, can we expect our voice to these people to be effective?

I cannot, however, agree with the logic of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], who proposes to do with this bill what he and his party have succeeded doing last week to the Defense Production Act, namely, to destroy the Voice of America, not directly, but indirectly by emasculating amendments.

If the Voice of America needs improvement, and I am sure it does, we cannot



get that improvement by cutting its funds so as to make it inoperative. Let us rather give it more strength by reorganizing it, weeding out the inefficient, and by this Congress making a firm declaration of our objectives and policies insofar as the future of the iron-curtain countries is concerned.

A good start would be the early enactment of the resolution which I introduced several months ago, calling for the repudiation of the Yalta and Tehran Agreements. It was the violation of these agreements by Soviet Russia that brought about the enslavement of the iron-curtain countries. Adoption of that resolution, followed by further positive acts in its furtherance, will do more to inspire confidence and good will in these people than anything else that we can possibly devise.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that what those people want to hear is what the gentleman said? And through the Voice of America we try to get over to the rest of the world that we are not an imperialistic Nation as those nations understand that term.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I fully agree with the gentleman.

(Mr. MACHROWICZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] mentioned the law that requires officials of the United States to travel on American flag ships. Heretofore the State Department bill has included a waiver of this law. In this bill, the waiver has been deleted. For this action I commend the gentleman from New York and the committee.

To ascertain whether fares on American-flag ships might be more expensive to the Government than fares on other ships I had a little investigation made of the matter. I find that the first-class fare on the *America*, our finest ship, is \$325 from New York to Southampton. The fare on the Dutch ship *Nieuw Amsterdam*, the pride of their fleet, is the same. The fares on the *Ile de France* and the *Liberte*, the two French-flag ships are \$335 and \$340, respectively; on the *Queen Mary* and the *Queen Elizabeth* the fare is \$375 on each.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I did not mean to compare passenger fares on American and foreign liners when I made my remarks yesterday. I was referring to what it might mean in per diems for State De-

partment officials and employees if they had to wait over in order to get an American ship. As I said yesterday, I am willing to go along on this so that we may have the American merchant marine get every revenue that it possibly can from the State Department. But I reserve my right in the final analysis to change my mind if it does not turn out satisfactorily, or if it is detrimental to the interests of our American taxpayers.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I thank the gentleman and agree with him. I am pleased, however, to have the RECORD show that as between American and foreign-flag ships, the American ships are not only as fine as any in the world but as inexpensive in the cost of travel upon them.

Mr. ROONEY. I am pleased that the gentleman has pointed this out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, when the President appointed Ed Barrett Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Elmer Davis, talking over the ABC network, remarked:

The job has been filled with the best man they could have found—one who knows the job already. We now get the best-qualified man in the country.

That was a newspaperman talking about a newspaperman. That was a former top-side Government information man talking about a man with whom he had worked and with whose abilities he was thoroughly familiar and who was about to take over the top-side information job of the world.

I do not know whether or not Barrett was listening to the Elmer Davis broadcast that evening, but, if he was, he must have felt pretty happy about that remark. I felt glad, in fact, to have an expert's opinion on the man who, in my opinion, was being given one of the most important jobs in Washington.

Mr. Davis was not the sole voice raised in approval of the appointment. Men who had worked with Barrett on newspapers, on magazines, in Government, were equally cordial in their endorsement of the President's choice. Editorial comment throughout the country was uniformly laudatory. The New York Times, for example, had this to say:

The President's choice of Edward Ware Barrett is a happy one. \* \* \* He has been reporter, editor, and editorial director of Newsweek Magazine, wartime overseas director for OWI, and a United States representative with UNESCO. \* \* \* In these and related capacities he has shown character and ability.

In my opinion, that "character and ability" has shown up in the kind of job Barrett has done. He has put real "guts" into the State Department information program both here at home and abroad.

The results have not surprised me. In the first place I have great respect for the opinion of Elmer Davis, the New York Times, and these other newspapermen

and newspapers. Secondly, I have liked Ed Barrett's attitude toward his job. I remember reading a magazine article somewhere in which he was quoted as having said that no information program could be worth more than the policy upon which it was based. In fact, he came right out and said:

We will be judged more by what we do than what we say.

I liked that. He was not trying to sell his program—the information program—by itself. He felt the merchandise he was offering had to be what it was alleged to be. He felt that that merchandise—our foreign policy—had to be topnotch if he was to put on a top-notch information program.

I have a feeling when I look at Ed Barrett that he would not be interested in the program under any other condition. But I have a very strong feeling when I look at him and when I hear him talk that he is very sure that this present program—our foreign policy—is just what he is telling the world it is.

We, the American people and particularly the United States Congress, have given Ed Barrett a tremendous job. I am convinced, with Elmer Davis, that he is just about the best man we could get to do it. I am for giving him the tools with which to do the kind of job he, and every other good American, wants to see done.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to say to the gentleman that the choice of Ed Barrett has proven quite satisfactory, since so much of the opposition to the Voice of America seems to go back prior to the time that Mr. Barrett took over as chief.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I certainly think there is merit in what the gentleman has said. Of course, as you know, the criticism that is directed has been directed to anybody who has received that appointment.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. Is it not true that there are a great many people who expect Mr. Barrett to pull a rabbit out of the hat and reform the thinking of the entire world overnight and expect him to come up with a finished product in a field in which we in America are entirely new at? This is a new practice, this business of international propaganda on a broad scale.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That anxiety has been expressed over and over again. It reminds me of the doctor giving his patient a prescription. He goes to the drugstore and gets it filled and takes one dose of it, and if he is not immediately cured there is something sinister and wrong with the doctor who wrote the prescription.

(Mr. BUDGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)



Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to yield time now?

Mr. ROONEY. I was looking forward to the illuminating address by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I am highly complimented by the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, [Mr. ROONEY,] and I am sure that he knows so much about this subject that I will be unable to illuminate it any further for his benefit. Suffice it to say that anyone might think from the course of this debate that this was a State Department, and particularly a Voice of America appropriation bill. Actually the bill involves the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments and the Federal Judiciary.

Mr. Chairman, I have not been able to be on the floor to hear every minute of the debate, but I must say that in the course of my long hours here I have not heard any mention made of either the Justice Department or the Commerce Department by any others than the two gentlemen who are the chairmen and the ranking minority member of the committee; therefore, perhaps, I may be pardoned for stepping outside of the present debate and mentioning the subject of the Commerce Department and in particular the Civil Aeronautics Administration which is in that department.

I recognize that in the eyes of my colleagues perhaps the Civil Aeronautics Administration does not have as much sex appeal as the Voice of America and the Department of State but, on the other hand, it certainly would be a matter of great concern to the people of the United States, if they knew what the entire story was. I will say to the gentleman from New York, I have read with great interest the entire hearings in respect to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, including all of the figures that were inserted in the RECORD at his suggestion by those who appeared before his subcommittee. I hope that the subcommittee members have also read those figures and the statements that are printed in small type in the hearings. If they have read those statements and those figures, I am sure that they will have been illuminated far more than I can illuminate them in the course of 10 minutes.

I should like to advert, if I may, to a time in 1940 when the President of the United States, sometime previously, in the course of an Executive order, abolished the Air Safety Board. Prior to that action there had been no serious air accident in something like 18 months. Shortly upon the issuance of that order there came a rash of air accidents in the United States. It was very serious indeed. The House of Representatives set up a committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable Jack Nichols, of Oklahoma, known as the Air Accident Investigating Committee of the House of Representatives. The other mem-

bers of that committee were the Honorable Everett Dirksen, the Honorable Richard M. Kleberg, the Honorable Herren Pearson, of Tennessee, and myself.

We proceeded in the next 2 years to investigate 28 fatal air accidents in the United States. One of the objects of the investigations was to find out, if we could, whether or not this Executive order had in any wise contributed to the rash of accidents. We thought at first it had. Later, toward the conclusion of our investigations, and indeed a detailed investigation of each of these accidents, we came to the conclusion that it probably had not; that the accidents were the result of suddenly increased transportation by air which overtaxed the facilities that then existed.

Among those facilities which then existed were a number of control towers operated in several airports in the United States by the local municipalities. I might say here that the employees of those control towers were generally patronage employees of the city council or the mayor of the city. For the most part the jobs paid so little that competent men could not be found to take them.

I remember particularly the accident that took place in Atlanta, Ga., which resulted in the broken back of Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker and the death of our beloved colleague, Mr. Byron, of Maryland. That was a horrible thing. It was our opinion, as I remember it now, that the control-tower operators were not as competent as they should be, although they were the best that could be had, and that if the control-tower operators had had greater experience, greater training, and were, let us say, men of higher caliber, the chances were that that accident would not have occurred.

Similar reports were made in respect to other places in the United States where accidents occurred.

We came back to the House of Representatives with a very strong report that all control towers at airports in the United States should be certainly under the supervision and licensing of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, if not the actual control of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

About the time World War II broke on the country, and the Air Force and the Navy, realizing the vital importance of control towers at airports, took them over and operated them. Through that intervention, control and operation of airport towers by the Federal Government established a method of procedure for the operation of these control towers and a uniformity was established throughout the Nation.

At the conclusion of the war, it was determined by the Federal Government, and our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce agreed entirely, that these control towers should remain under the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and that all personnel engaged in their operation should be licensed and trained by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The Congress agreed.

Subsequent to that time the number of control towers that were so operated has increased. There is a criterion established by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for any airport where a control tower should be established. I believe, if I remember correctly, that the maximum number of operations in an airport uncontrolled should be 15,000 per month. Over and above that number that is determined by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the traffic of that airport is considered so hazardous that a control tower with licensed personnel should there be established.

So now we have some 165 or more control towers which are operated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Some of them are on a part-time basis. It is possible that others might go on a part-time basis. But at the same time we have not had accidents attributable to faulty control-tower operation except perhaps the one here at the National Airport where the Bolivian pilot got tangled up with an Eastern Airlines' plane—an accident which resulted in the untimely and tragic death of one of our colleagues, as well as many others who were on the plane.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that this committee for as long as I can remember has never done anything appropriationwise to impair the accident-safety program of the CAA?

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the committee has done pretty well in the past. I notice they have stricken certain funds from this bill which provided, among other things, for the inclusion of four additional control towers, in their handling of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. That is not so, I must say to the gentleman from California. The amount recommended for salaries and expenses for the CAA is \$600,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1951. However, when nonrecurring items, deductions for rents, utilities, and procurement charges assumed by the General Services Agency, and so forth, are taken into consideration, the amount allowed is actually \$2,324,895 over the 1952 basis.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks, although I disagree. I notice, according to the committee report, that salaries and expenses for the CAA are reduced \$3,700,000 from the 1952 estimate. I notice also in the course of the hearings the gentleman who appeared on behalf of the Civil Aeronautics Administration stated, and stated quite clearly to the committee, that they were putting in a very minimum operating budget. I am not criticizing the gentleman from New York, but I am merely pointing out the facts as stated by them. If the gentleman has other ideas, and evidently he has, then he must assume the responsibility for those ideas. But I am merely stating them as I find them in the record.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I desire to include in the RECORD a letter ad-



dressed to me by the Administrator of the CAA, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, July 16, 1951.

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Congressman HINSHAW: In reply to your request, as a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, for information as to the effect on operations of this agency of reductions made by the House Appropriations Committee in the appropriation estimates of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for fiscal year 1952, I am pleased to give you the following information arranged according to appropriation headings as they appear in the bill:

*Salaries and Expenses*

|                             |               |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Budget estimate-----        | \$102,800,000 |
| House Committee allowance-- | 99,100,000    |
| Reduction -----             | 3,700,000     |

The appropriation requested under this head for the fiscal year 1952 was based on holding all activities to the level authorized for the fiscal year 1951, except in the case of the program for operation and maintenance of the Federal airways system. The increase requested for the Federal airways program is necessary to provide for operating on a full-year basis, facilities first commissioned during fiscal year 1951 and, therefore, operated only for part of the year in 1951; and to provide for the necessary expansion in facilities and services to handle the greatly increased workload generated principally by greatly increased military use of the airways system. Dollar requirements for other activities financed from this appropriation are very important but are relatively small. Any substantial reduction in these other programs, such as aviation safety, would render their operations ineffective. Hence, it will be necessary to apply practically the entire reduction to the program for operation and maintenance of the Federal airways system. Although time has not permitted a final study, I believe the reduction of \$3,700,000 will have to be applied as follows:

1. We will be unable to commission the new facilities previously authorized and now under construction and scheduled for operation during fiscal year 1952 (item such as instrument (blind) landing systems, radars, electronic distance measuring equipments, control towers, and communications stations are included), \$1,600,000.

2. We will eliminate additional services, principally interphone and teletype rentals required for relaying air traffic control and weather data; and, normal replacement equipment purchase requirements will not be met, \$900,000.

3. We shall have to decommission some facilities presently in operation (probably about 27 aeronautical communications stations and 10 airport traffic control towers), \$1,200,000.

Prior to finally determining which of the facilities would be decommissioned, a careful evaluation of each of the 167 control towers and 462 communications stations presently in service would be made, to determine what relative effect eliminating individual stations and towers would have on the needs of military and civil aviation. This analysis would give consideration to the necessary program for decommissioning specific towers and stations. The following is a tentative list of relatively low activity facilities which may have to be decommissioned.

Airport traffic control towers: Reading, Pa.; Van Nuys, Calif.; Salem, Oreg.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Niagara Falls, N. Y.; San Antonio (Stinson), Tex.; Pendleton, Oreg.; Fargo, N. Dak.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Ogden, Utah.

Aeronautical communications stations: St. Croix, V. I.; Green Bay, Wis.; Scottsbluff, Nebr.; Winhemucca, Nev.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Madison, Wis.; Huron, S. Dak.; St. Joseph, Mo.; Sheridan, Wyo.; Butte, Mont.; Fargo, N. Dak.; Laredo, Tex.; Dodge City, Kans.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Moorecroft, Wyo.; Rapid City, S. Dak.; Hanksville, Utah; Mullan Pass, Mont.; Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; Galveston, Tex.; Butler, Mo.; Casper, Wyo.; Chadron, Nebr.; Lexington, Nebr.; Watertown, S. Dak.; Tonopah, Nev.; Kallispell, Mont.

While these adjustments would provide the most reasonable basis of curtailing our regular operating programs to conform with the House committee's recommendations, continued operation of the facilities listed above is highly advisable and it should be recognized that their elimination would seriously interfere with services currently provided to users of both civil and military aircraft. In particular, the facilities listed above are considered important to the national and the civil-defense programs.

*Establishment of air navigation facilities*

|                             |              |
|-----------------------------|--------------|
| Budget estimate-----        | \$37,150,000 |
| House Committee allowance-- | 20,000,000   |
| Reduction -----             | 17,150,000   |

The reduction recommended in this appropriation will further delay the completion of the "common system" (Navy, Air Force, and civil) of air-navigation aids. In addition, it will seriously curtail necessary relocation, modernization, or improvement of certain existing communication, electronic and visual air navigation facilities in the amounts indicated:

1. Air navigation, electronic, and visual aids, \$9,638,203 (includes 17 precision approach radar systems, 22 high intensity approach light installations, and 162 distance measuring equipment installations).

2. Repairs to intermediate landing fields, \$288,725 (required for the repair and improvement of emergency landing fields at four locations, namely: Columbus, N. Mex.; Salt Flat, Tex.; Vichy, Mo.; and Beaver Marsh, Oreg.).

3. Air traffic-control towers and centers, \$5,003,690, (includes funds for (a) establishment of four new towers at Springfield, Mo.; Wheeling, W. Va.; Newport News, Va.; Twin Falls, Idaho; (b) installation of 13 surveillance radar equipments in towers at Akron-Canton, Ohio; Amarillo, Tex.; Fort Wayne, Ind.; Great Falls, Mont.; Greensboro, N. C.; Miami, Fla.; Omaha, Nebr.; Richmond, Va.; Syracuse, N. Y.; Toledo, Ohio; Wichita, Kans.; Windsor Locks, Conn.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; (aeronautical center); (c) modernization and improvement of some existing radar and radio equipments used in towers and centers).

4. Aeronautical communications facilities, \$2,219,382 (includes funds for enlarging certain aeronautical communications stations and to replace existing VHF air/ground communications equipments with new and reliable units).

The original plan was to have installation of the "common system" completed by the end of fiscal year 1953. The action taken by the Congress on estimates for fiscal year 1951, when only \$5,500,000 was appropriated for new facilities, required moving this date ahead to 1954. The reduction proposed by the House committee on the 1952 estimate will further delay completion of this system. The Congressional Air Policy Board urged the rapid completion of the system.

*Technical development and evaluation*

|                                |             |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Budget estimate-----           | \$1,375,000 |
| House committee allowance----- | 1,200,000   |
| Reduction -----                | 175,000     |

The Technical Development and Evaluation Center, located at Indianapolis, Ind.,

carries on a number of projects for the purpose of developing and evaluating improved electronic air navigation aids, aircraft safety devices, and other projects having as their objective the improvement of various aeronautical equipments, such as aircraft radio receivers; aircraft fire prevention, detection, and extinguishing equipment; instrument landing systems; surveillance radar; and approach and runway lights. The reduction made by the House committee would require the complete elimination of at least five projects and would curtail the work to be performed on six continuing projects.

*Federal-aid airport program*

|                                |              |
|--------------------------------|--------------|
| Budget estimate-----           | \$54,000,000 |
| House committee allowance----- | 35,840,000   |
| Reduction -----                | 18,160,000   |

Our 1952 estimates were based on a program of \$21,000,000 for new projects, of which \$20,000,000 was for projects in the continental United States. Against this amount we have requests from 255 city, county, and State sponsors, with matching funds available, in the amount of \$58,000,000 for airport-improvement work, all of which meet the President's criteria for the present defense-construction program. The effect of the \$3,000,000 reduction in project funds would, of course, curtail both the number of locations and the scope of the planned airport-construction projects. In addition, it would retard work we are currently doing with the military on the reactivation of certain airports to achieve joint civil-military usage, \$3,000,000.

The reduction of \$15,000,000 in the amount requested for liquidation of prior-year-contract authority may cause some delays in making funds available to meet authorizations already granted, \$15,000,000.

The reduction applied to the administrative expense limitation could have been absorbed by carrying over prior-year balances produced by agency economies in 1951, except that regulations recently issued by the Labor Department, which are mandatory in this program, require additional activities not included in the original budget which must be financed in 1952 at an estimated cost of \$275,000. Thus, the \$100,000 requested will be required or the effectiveness of engineering supervision will be seriously reduced, \$100,000.

Reducing the limitation in the amount transferable to "Salaries and expenses" will curtail, by approximately 10 percent, services such as accounting, supply, legal, project auditing, contracting, and payroll. Workload in this area involves servicing the total program on an accrual basis and is not subject to change in direct proportion to the new program allowance, \$60,000.

*Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory of Alaska*

|                                |           |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| Budget estimate-----           | \$450,000 |
| House committee allowance----- | 225,000   |
| Reduction-----                 | 225,000   |

This appropriation was requested for the first year's operation of two new airports constructed with Federal funds at Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska, at the urgent request of the Air Force. The action taken by the committee was apparently based on the premise that all facilities at the two locations would not be available for operation during the fiscal year 1952. While it is true that the administration building and certain other structures will not be completed, the runways and other basic operating facilities are ready, and should be placed in service. These airports were constructed pursuant to Public Law 562, Eightieth Congress, by the Federal Government primarily to permit removing civil air traffic from Air Force bases at the two locations. The Department of Defense is insisting that civilian operations



be moved to the new airports at the earliest possible date.

As the Air Force bases have been operated by Air Force personnel, it will be necessary for the CAA to provide a new complement of personnel to operate the new fields. The allowance of \$225,000 will be inadequate to hire the necessary personnel and to purchase services, supplies, and equipment required for the new operation. On the basis of an evaluation just completed, it is believed that the requirements of these two airports may be met with an appropriation of \$370,000 to cover operating costs during fiscal year 1952.

#### *Transport aircraft development*

|                                |           |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| Budget estimate-----           | \$600,000 |
| House committee allowance----- |           |
| Reduction-----                 | 600,000   |

The appropriation under this head was submitted as the first step in carrying out the provisions of Public Law 867, Eighty-first Congress, which authorizes an appropriation of \$12,500,000 over a 5-year period which will be used for the development of engines, airframes, rotors, instruments, accessories, and, particularly, turbine-jet and turbine-prop-powered aircraft. It is considered essential that funds be provided for this purpose if the United States is to regain its position as a leader in the field of transport-aircraft production and if we are to develop to the necessary extent the vast potentialities of jet- and turbine-driven air transports for civil and military purposes.

As stated to you in my letter of July 9, 1951, this agency has improved its management and has effected savings in personnel and equipment so that we have absorbed workload created by a 24.1-percent increase in commercial- and military-aircraft operations, without over-all increases in personnel during the fiscal years 1949, 1950, and 1951. However, we have now arrived at the point where there can be no substantial reductions in the funds programed and requested for maintenance and establishment of airways without corresponding reductions in our airways services and installations, which are in use by, and necessary to, both our military air power and to all our civil air industry which is essential to our national economy.

The foregoing outlines the probable effects of the major changes made by the House committee in the budget estimates of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. If you desire further details, I shall be glad to furnish them.

Sincerely yours,

C. F. HORNE,

*Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.*

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. In this item for salaries and expenses for the Civil Aeronautics Administration there is a total of over \$26,000,000 for other objects, including travel, transportation of things, supplies and materials, equipment, and so forth. A considerable portion of the reduction made by the committee can be applied to those other objects, rather than to the operation of the Federal airways.

Why should the cut be applied practically in its entirety to operation of the Federal airways? Why cannot reductions be made in other activities such as: general counsel, operation of aircraft, executive direction, staff and administrative services, and so forth, for which several millions of dollars are budgeted? I might point out to the distinguished gentleman that under the appropriation title salaries and ex-

penses CAA, there were over 600 vacancies as of June 30, just past.

Of course, if we were to give them all the money they requested I have no doubt that they would find ways and means of spending it. One method would be to continue the wholesale upgrading of personnel. I was amazed to discover just the other day that during the last 3 years they have increased the number of GS 14's and 15's, the generals who are paid from \$8,800 to \$11,000, from a total of 73 to 205. Between 1948 and 1951 they have almost trebled the number of positions in the top-salary bracket. If we choose, we can encourage them to continue until they do not have any privates but so far as I am concerned that's no way to run a railroad or an airways system either. I can't see why CAA needs over twice as many 14's and 15's as the FBI and seven times as many as the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield me some further time?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have been, of course, very deeply interested and concerned in this subject because I was a vice chairman of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board in 1947 and 1948, a board upon which the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] sat. In 1947 my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held some hearings on safety in air navigation. We studied the matter very carefully because there again arose a rash of air accidents. We discovered at that time a very important fact not related directly to those accidents. We discovered that the Air Force, the Navy, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration were about to go off in three different directions at the same time in respect to the adoption of means to aid in air navigation. It would be the same thing as if you were to set up three separate traffic light systems here at the intersection of Constitution Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue, one of which the Navy could see and nobody else could see, one which the Civil Aeronautics system users could see and nobody else could see, and the other which the Air Force could see and nobody else could see. That would result in the utmost confusion and probably result in serious accidents, to say nothing of the fact that by the adoption of three separate systems of aids to air navigation, you would have three very large bills against the United States for the establishment of these three separate systems.

So we demanded of those three agencies of Government dealing in aeronautics that they get together and come up with a system that was common to all three, so that everyone who flew would know the signs and signals and would know the roads. That resulted in the establishment of a subcommittee 31-3 of the Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics. They studied the sub-

ject. They wrangled with each other. They came up with a report and presented it to the Congress of the United States through the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, what was to be known as the common system of aids to air navigation and landing, and the CAA proceeded, through appropriations made by the Congress, toward the installation of the equipment required to establish that common system. It was hoped that the transition stage of that common system might be completely established by 1952. That was a certain target date that was set up in the interest of the national defense when that should be completed. The system included surveillance radars which could be used in conjunction with the defense of our country against attack by air.

Last year there was a reduction in appropriation for the establishment of these aids to navigation which has caused a postponement of the completion date. This year the CAA has come up with a request amounting to \$27,000,000 for establishment of air-navigation facilities, including radar sets. I find in the committee's report that they have cut that request by \$17,150,000. All that does is postpone for a certain further period, which could be calculated, perhaps another year, the completion of this very important system. It is important not only to civil aviation. It is important to the Navy and to the Air Force and to the defense of our country against air attack. It is a completion date that is vitally important to all concerned and should not be postponed.

On inquiry from the Department of Commerce, Civil Aeronautics Administration, I learned that the reduction in personnel items has been such that they are unable to commission the facilities allowed last year, let alone supply the needed additional personnel for the year 1952. I am sure the committee did not intend to do any such thing as that, and that it was their zeal for reduction in budget—and with that I cannot disagree, of course—but their zeal for a reduction of budget, a zeal in which we all join, that caused them to make that reduction, which I believe to be a very serious mistake. I would not be standing here arguing for the restoration of funds in this budget unless I believed in their necessity so heartily that I would be willing to go home and defend my action before my own people. I am sure nobody else on this floor would take a different position. I am sure I can defend that action.

I am not going into the other arguments, but there are several things of importance. But at this point I desire to include another letter to me from the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, as follows:

WASHINGTON, July 9, 1951.

HON. CARL HINSHAW,

*House of Representatives,*

*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HINSHAW: In response to your inquiry regarding the utilization of CAA personnel and the relationship between personnel, workload, and commissioning of facilities, I am pleased to give you the following information.

On June 30, 1949, total employment in the Civil Aeronautics Administration was 16,677



compared with 16,718 on May 31, 1951, the latest reporting date. In addition to regular operating personnel, these figures include employees engaged in the program for establishment of new and improved air navigation aids and the Federal-aid airport program.

As you know, the Civil Aeronautics Administration maintains and operates facilities used both by military and civil aircraft. The following tabulation sets forth the increase in the major types of facilities and in miles of airways serviced since June 30, 1949:

| Description                                       | Number<br>June 30,<br>1949 | Number<br>May 31,<br>1951 | In-<br>crease |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| Miles of airways.....                             | 60,213                     | 71,850                    | 11,636        |
| Very high frequency radio<br>ranges.....          | 230                        | 354                       | 124           |
| Air traffic control towers.....                   | 158                        | 165                       | 7             |
| Instrument landing sys-<br>tems.....              | 89                         | 96                        | 7             |
| Traffic control centers.....                      | 30                         | 32                        | 2             |
| Low frequency navigation<br>aids.....             | 486                        | 521                       | 35            |
| Precision approach and<br>surveillance radar..... | 6                          | 18                        | 12            |

In those regular operating activities of the Administration which are financed from the salaries and expenses appropriation, actual employment on June 30, 1949, was 14,825. On May 31, 1951, employment was 14,795. There has, therefore, been no increase in numbers of operating personnel during the last 2 years despite a substantial increase in workload resulting from an increase of 24.1 percent in commercial and military aircraft operations, and an increase of 18.1 percent in CAA facilities as listed above.

We have now arrived at the point where the operation of additional facilities and the handling of greatly increased air traffic, which are essential to our national defense and to our national economy, cannot be accomplished without additional operating personnel as requested in our fiscal year 1952 appropriation estimates. The situation is further complicated by the fact that, while we had contemplated the discontinuance of 53 low-frequency four-course radio ranges in fiscal year 1942, the Navigation Panel of the Air Coordinating Committee has stated that their continued operation is essential from the standpoint of national defense and civil aircraft operations. We will, therefore, be unable, in fiscal year 1952, to discontinue the operation and maintenance of these facilities, although the funds required for this purpose were eliminated from our 1952 budget estimates.

The following are other examples of increases in workload which we have absorbed without an over-all increase in personnel from June 30, 1949, to date:

1. During the past year there has been a considerable increase in civil airways traffic and a large increase in military airways traffic, particularly since the outbreak of the Korean conflict.

2. At the request of the Department of Defense, we have materially increased the scope of services rendered, particularly in controlling the air space in specified air-defense zones and in air-ground and point-to-point communication services to military aircraft. The cost of operating these services during fiscal year 1951 was \$1,268,000. These dollars were made available by eliminating the least important civil functions being performed, thereby obviating the necessity for requesting additional appropriations from the Congress.

3. The National Production Administration has assigned to this agency the responsibility for acting as claimant agent for air navigation facilities, for airport construction, for all nonair carrier aircraft, and for all civil aircraft parts and components. This

responsibility required the establishment of a special office to handle the work, the cost of which was absorbed within the funds available to the agency.

To date, we have been able, through various methods, to handle this increased workload without increasing the staffing of the agency.

Considerable improvements in efficiency and economy resulted from a program for improved management which was initiated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration in the fall of 1948. At that time, we decided to review our organization structure to determine whether it was properly established to achieve its objectives in the most economical manner. To help us with the analysis of our organizational and general management problems, we employed the services of a competent management engineering firm. This firm made numerous recommendations, most of which were adopted. We approached the problem from the point of view that we should scrutinize closely the manpower required to carry out our responsibilities. Consequently at the start, as vacancies occurred, we required a complete review of the need for each such position and if the position proved essential we filled it, wherever possible, by reassignment rather than by new employment. This procedure was adopted to eliminate all non-essential positions and was continued in effect for the greater part of two years. The net result of all efforts at management improvement was the elimination of 446 positions and the reassignment or transfer of 1,119 employees. Since that time, it has been necessary to establish 417 positions to handle a portion of the increased workload and all of the new facilities referred to above. By these reductions and reassignments, the morale of the agency has greatly improved because each employee has a full day of essential work to perform.

After establishing our organization as a result of these studies, we gave attention to other management improvement devices. Among these has been the inauguration of a system of periodic appraisals of the management of our larger field installations. The objective of these appraisals is to obtain a critical analysis of the effectiveness of the Administration's program in the field.

To insure that we continue to obtain maximum results for dollars expended, the CAA has materially tightened its budgetary review processes and has installed a system of planned work programs to control and monitor the utilization of personnel and funds.

Through these various methods, I believe we have held the manpower and dollar requirements of the Civil Aeronautics Administration at a minimum consistent with approved programs which are necessary to American air power. However, as pointed out earlier in this communication, we will be unable to commission facilities now under construction and to maintain essential services rendered unless the increases in operating personnel requested for 1952 are granted. These increases recognize certain essential defense services being performed and the necessity for increases in these services as the National Military Establishment grows and as essential civil aviation increases.

Your continued interest in the activities of the Civil Aeronautics Administration is appreciated. If you desire additional information, I shall be glad to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

C. F. HORNE,  
*Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. There are several points I would like to bring out, but here is one that I am unable to understand at all:

We have a sum of money that was requested in the amount of \$600,000, which is called transport aircraft development. It actually comes under a bill which we passed some time ago, that came out of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to provide for the testing of prototypes of transport aircraft. Why did we ask for that money? Why did the Congress authorize this committee to provide \$12,000,000, I believe it was, for the testing of prototype transport aircraft.

Mr. PRIEST. As I recall the authorization at the time, that was the amount.

Mr. HINSHAW. For the testing?

Mr. PRIEST. For the testing. That is the amount.

Mr. HINSHAW. Now, why have they asked for \$600,000 of that money? Let me go back a little. At the conclusion of World War II the Germans had just got their jet-type aircraft into the air. If they had been developed by the Germans a couple of months before they actually were put into the air, the chances of our propeller type fighters and bombers being knocked out of the sky would have been good, and the whole course of the war might have been changed.

Shortly after the end of the war the British started out developing the jet-type transport aircraft. What did the United States do about it? Precisely nothing. We here unanimously passed a bill in this House in 1948 to provide for the construction of prototype transport aircraft, which would have kept us abreast of the world in respect to the jet-type transport aircraft, but it did not get passed in the other body, and hence nothing has been done. The British, however, went ahead and they have spent perhaps a hundred or two hundred millions in the development of jet-type transport aircraft. Where they got their money I do not know, but you can figure that out yourself. Mr. Chairman, the British are now offering to sell those jet aircraft to other nations of the world; they are even offering those jet type transports to our own airlines in the United States, to say nothing of the National Defense Establishment itself. Where, for goodness' sakes, have we been all this time?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. Is it not probably true that if we had an air navigation system adequate at our airports that some of our commercial lines would be having some of those jet type aircrafts today?

Mr. HINSHAW. Certainly they would. We are running the risk in our manufacturing industry of finding ourselves completely out of date in respect to the building of jet-transport aircraft and the entire business going to Europe, if you please. How silly and absurd that is. Why is that so? The reason is that the cost of developing modern air-transport types is so great, running now from \$25,000,000 to \$40,000,000 to



perhaps \$50,000,000 that there is not a private manufacturer in the United States who can afford risking that kind of money on his own.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will give me a little more time.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the gentleman discussing this subject has had ample time.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; give me a little more time.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman is making so many misstatements.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield unless the gentleman yields me more time, and I have not made any misstatement.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman does not want to answer me.

Mr. HINSHAW. Certainly I do, but I want sufficient time in which to do it.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the gentleman's time expired?

Mr. HINSHAW. Practically.

The CHAIRMAN. It has not; the gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HINSHAW. I cannot yield if the gentleman cannot give me more time for I wish to use this remaining minute in concluding my remarks.

In conclusion let me say that I find no justification in the record for striking out the \$600,000 for transport aircraft development. Actually the purpose is to permit the Civil Aeronautics Administration to borrow two B-45 jet-type aircraft from the Air Force in order to test the operation of such jet aircraft in and about congested airports such as Chicago, New York, and so forth, to see whether or not they might be able to fit into the traffic patterns without hazard to slower aircraft, and other similar purposes.

Another subject is the testing of helicopters. There are new helicopters that ought to be tested in commercial operation, and I do not know how it is going to be done unless the appropriations are provided for it. At this point I desire to include a quotation from American Aviation Daily which summarizes the Government's basic commercial helicopter policy as follows:

[From American Aviation Daily of July 20, 1951]

#### GOVERNMENT ADOPTS BASIC COMMERCIAL HELICOPTER POLICY

Continued and broadened Government support of commercial helicopter development and utilization has been assured by the approval yesterday of the Air Coordinating Committee's report entitled "Federal Policy Regarding the Development of Commercial Transport Helicopters." This report, in preparation for the past 6 months, was requested of ACC by the Post Office Department to determine the advisability for further Government support in this field and the extent and manner of this support.

In addition to answering the Post Office request for an objective report on helicopter accomplishments and potential, the ACC report has been adopted by the Prototype Aircraft Advisory Committee as the basis for prototype development in this field.

Principal value of the document, in addition to establishing a concise and constructive Government policy favoring the continued Federal support of helicopter devel-

opment, is the outlining of a proposed program of action for each of the Government agencies involved in helicopter activities:

#### POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

1. Continued use of existing helicopter mail services in Los Angeles and Chicago and maximum use of such additional metropolitan area services as the CAB certificates in the future.

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

1. Continued encouragement of existing helicopter services.

2. Similar services should be authorized in other large metropolitan areas as required by convenience and necessity.

3. Study probable impact of multiengine transport helicopters on the travel market in connection with future route pattern planning and route proceedings.

4. Continue its generally sympathetic and promotional approach in formulation and application of helicopter rules and regulations.

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

1. Collaborate with CAB in sympathetic and promotional approach in the formulation and application of civil air regulations.

2. Under Public Law 867 (prototype testing law) request funds for testing and simulated airline operation of transport helicopters. Such tests should take into consideration the military operational experience of the helicopters.

3. Through the Technical Subcommittee of the Prototype Aircraft Advisory Committee draft specification for one or more transport helicopter types of advanced design.

4. Study communications, traffic control, navigational and landing-aid facilities and related operational aspects of such helicopters.

5. Continue its study of heliport requirements and make appropriate provisions for heliport construction in the Federal-aid airport program.

6. Offer airport advisory service to communities which include heliport construction, maintenance, and operation information.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

1. Through established claimant agencies permit purchase of a limited number of transport helicopters by commercial airlines for prototype testing and simulated airline operation when the international situation permits.

2. Make available on loan or otherwise to designated contractors a limited number of transport helicopters for prototype testing under Public Law 867.

#### NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

1. NACA should increase its emphasis on basic rotary-wing research covering stability, fatigue, rotor-blade sections, anti-icing, instrument flight, drag and power requirements of compound helicopter configuration and design parameters for higher flight speeds.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot get along with these vitally important projects without the interest and cooperation of the Appropriations Committee, and particularly its subcommittee dealing with this subject. I respectfully suggest that they lift their eyes to the facts of life.

Mr. Chairman, under authority granted on yesterday I intend to include certain excerpts and correspondence in my remarks.

(Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, it all depends upon whose eyes we look through. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] looks through the eyes of the Air Transport Association which lobbies for the big airlines. When he states that he finds no justification for striking this \$600,000 request from the bill, he apparently has not read the committee's report on the subject which reads as follows:

The budget estimate of \$600,000 contained in House Document No. 178, for expenses relating to the development of improved transport aircraft is denied. It was testified that this testing would contribute very little to national defense, but would be primarily for the benefit of the commercial airlines. This type of aircraft development should be carried on and financed by the plane manufacturers and the commercial airlines rather than the Federal Government.

Under permission heretofore granted me by the House I insert at this point in the RECORD the entire testimony given by Mr. Amos Heacock before this subcommittee on Wednesday, June 27, 1951, which I believe will satisfactorily explain the action of the committee in this regard.

#### TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT, WEDNESDAY JUNE 27, 1951

(Witness: Amos Heacock, representing domestic nonscheduled air carriers)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Heacock, I have been given to understand that you have sought the privilege of appearing before this committee and giving us the benefit of your views with regard to some requested appropriation?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. Which appropriation?

Mr. HEACOCK. The appropriation, I believe, is for \$600,000—

Mr. ROONEY. Civil Aeronautics Administration, the turbo-jet testing?

Mr. HEACOCK. That is correct; the testing program.

Mr. ROONEY. What is your idea concerning approval of that request?

Mr. HEACOCK. I represent the domestic nonscheduled air carriers, the Air Coach Transport Association.

Mr. ROONEY. You might, before you give us your views, give us your background.

#### OBJECTIONS TO PENDING REQUEST

Mr. HEACOCK. I have appeared representing the nonscheduled air carriers of the country in opposition to the bill, the prototype testing bill involved here.

My basic objections are the objections of our carriers—which are nonsubsidized carriers, as you understand—that the bill was pre-Korean legislation, and did not take into account the totally new and different requirements of semimobilization.

It was designed at a time when we believed, or at least the proponents of the bill believed, that they had to catch up with the British lead, their commercial lead, in jet aircraft. I pointed these deficiencies out at the time and opposed the plan.

I later became a member of the Prototype Aircraft Advisory Committee appointed by Mr. Lee, and for a while I believed that some defense purpose could be served by the bill. The crying need of the military now is for large numbers of cargo transports and since, as a kind of an afterthought, they provided in the program for the development of cargo aircraft, we hoped that we might get something in the way of defense usefulness.

However, this appropriation, as you will see, is primarily concerned with testing a B-45 bomber, to gather theoretical information for jet-transport operation.



It was admitted during the course of the proceedings that the information gained would be of very limited value. First of all, the B-45 is not a transport. It has different wing loadings. Any stress testing for effect on passengers from vibration, and so forth, would only be applicable to a B-45 and not to a comparable jet transport.

The information that the CAA would gain as to proper and safe procedures for handling these aircraft in traffic patterns, they will certainly be gaining through the numbers of jet bombers that are being shuttled back and forth on training missions.

The benefits, if any, gained for jet-transport development would have to be deferred until after this war. There is no military authority yet that can see any use in jet transports and none such, except for extremely special-purpose jobs, have been ordered because of the high cost of operation of that craft.

Therefore, if you did gain information, the production of these transports would occur at such a late date that the data obtained would be obsolete.

Also, there is a heavy expense involved in this program. I have pushed for the maximum development of the airlift reserve and our companies right now are moving maximum loads of passengers, military passengers, out of the ports of embarkation at Seattle and San Francisco, and moving military personnel to those ports. The military idea is to give a forced expansion—

Mr. ROONEY. And all without subsidy presently being received by the airlines which carry the mails?

Mr. HEACOCK. That is correct; absolutely without subsidy. Furthermore, the Army has figured that it costs them 7.3 cents a mile to move these soldiers by rail, including the cost of providing the kitchens and services such as MP's, guards, and so forth, and the time of the men involved.

They are now moving by air for around 4.25 cents per mile average; that is, 4.25 cents per air mile as compared to a surface mile—there are a great many more of them—at 7.3 cents.

So the Army is enthusiastic about the idea because of the developments, projected by Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Major General Gavin, General Ridgway, and these airborne people, of getting our Army airborne.

And then we had hoped that maybe we would get some good out of this prototype testing bill by testing and developing a cargo transport, to help get that into production for this emergency.

As to my own background, I was in the Troop Carrier Command in the last war. I know the need for this type of transport. I advocated in 1943 the assault-type transports, which the Army embraces today. As a result I became liaison officer of the Troop Carrier Command for Gen. Carl Spaatz. I followed this development through the Army to the present day, and there is quite a struggle within the Army, and between the Army and the Air Force, with the Army demanding an assault-type of transport that will be able to take off and land in about 500 or 700 feet, and deploy the troops right along the battle front, instead of concentrating upon the long-haul huge transports which cannot land on anything but a 6,000-foot concrete runway.

The deficiency, as the Army points out to the Air Force, is that when you get the troops to an airport in Japan you have to unload everything, truck them over to another airplane, a C-46 or a C-47, and fly to the southern part of Japan, and then they transfer into a C-19, and then they get into the battle area as best they can, and they have to have a prepared runway.

They want a type of airplane which is going to bring up these troops from the bases in the United States, transport them the whole distance, and deploy them along the

battle line, because they can land on an open field. That is the theory.

That is why I opposed this bill in the first place, asking instead a realistic approach toward an air merchant marine bill—an air merchant marine bill which would build the type of aircraft that the Army wants, and lease them for commercial operation, and the lessors would pay back the cost to the Government in leases. This could be done as a nonsubsidized operation.

I am an operator myself, gentlemen. I have my own company. In a year it came to the top in the field of the Alaska office, and has developed one of the low-cost operations in the country. I assure you that, with the aircraft, it is possible to develop an airlift reserve in the United States today completely self-sufficient, without subsidy, of about five times the airlift capacity that we have today.

#### SUBSIDIES

Mr. ROONEY. Since you mentioned the subject of subsidy, Mr. Heacock, what are your views with regard to separation of air mail pay from subsidy money?

Mr. HEACOCK. I will speak on that tomorrow before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. ROONEY. Will you just briefly tell us your idea of it?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes. We are in favor of separation of subsidy, but we want to go further than that. We believe that there is no necessity for subsidy at all in the air transportation system today. We have proved it.

We have gone out and provided 4-cent-a-mile transportation when it was said that it could not be done. We saw one airline after another cut their rates and make more money at lower rates than they made at the higher rates.

As an example, in 1949 the scheduled air carriers had an average price of 5½ cents. With the impact of trying to compete with nonscheduled rates, getting their coach rates into effect, the family plans, and so forth, they came down to an average of 5½ cents for 1950, and increased their profit.

We have established through nonsubsidized operations a 3-cent-a-mile operation between Los Angeles and San Francisco, and we have seen two scheduled lines follow into the path. We have seen something happen that has happened no place else in the world, where 60 percent of all traffic moves by air between Los Angeles and San Francisco, because many people will not bother to take the train, since it is cheaper to fly by air at 3 cents a mile.

The aircraft are for us the real method of transportation.

They get the same revenue as a 5½-cent-per-mile transport in transcontinental operations.

We have proved it can be done. We believe that we have to have a radical disassociation from subsidy.

If you want to put your money where it will do the most good for developing a sound air transportation system, do it just like you would in building a house. If you want to build a house, and you find that you have been dealing with a carpenter who was sitting around on a cost-plus contract and doing a slothful operation, and was not getting the work out, you could go around and get a group of four or five unemployed carpenters and say, "Okay; we will finance your tools to do the job and then rent them to you, and you can pay for your tools out of your pay. If you do not prove efficient you will get 'canned.'"

In other words, let us build an air transportation system that way. If the carrier is efficient and pays its leases and puts the money back into the Public Treasury, it is all right; if it is inefficient it falls by the wayside.

Since 1988 there has not been an air carrier fall by the wayside which has had a certificate of public convenience and necessity. It cannot. The difference between its revenues and its expenses is paid out of the public purse.

We have an amazing situation in Alaska now. There is the Alaska Service case. There are two carriers serving a population of only 100,000. There is Pan American and Northwest. On top of that there were two more certificated carriers, the Alaska Airlines and Pacific Northern. Their ton-mile costs of operation range from 45 cents a ton-mile for Pan American up to fifty-some-odd cents per ton-mile for Northwest, and up as high as 84 cents a ton-mile for Pacific Northern, and yet those four carriers have been declared fit, willing, and able to carry freight at 19 cents a ton-mile, just to knock out of the picture some 13 to 25 nonscheduled air carriers that went in there with a low-cost operation and provided the freight at a low price. That is the situation.

Today the cost of \$6,500,000 mail pay in that Alaska picture may well be doubled—in the face of an offer, at least by my company, to carry the mail up there for \$1 a year, 1,000 pounds each way, and the excess to be paid for at our common-carriage rates of 19 cents a ton-mile plus 5 cents a ton-mile. That kind of an operation is similar to that of air freight operators in the United States such as Slick, the Flying Tigers, and United States Airlines, who have proved they can establish, on a nonsubsidized basis, much lower costs of operation.

If the mail, for instance, were disassociated from the subsidy we would be having a 4-cent air-mail stamp and an expanded service. The subsidy should be obsolete. It should be a thing of the past in connection with airline operations. It is not necessary.

Mr. ROONEY. I want to assure you, Mr. Heacock, that your remarks are, to say the least, highly enlightening to this committee. I think we should have heard this testimony quite a few years back. We all would have felt more assured of our position. Our position has been similar to yours.

When I say "our position" I refer to both the minority and majority members of this committee. We are indeed grateful that you took the time to come here today and give us the benefit of your views on this subject. Mr. Marshall?

Mr. MARSHALL. No questions, Mr. Chairman. Mr. ROONEY. Mr. STEFAN?

#### GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Mr. STEFAN. What is the name of your company, Mr. Heacock?

Mr. HEACOCK. My company is Air Transports Associated.

Mr. STEFAN. Where is your headquarters? Mr. HEACOCK. At Seattle. That is my company.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the name of your association?

Mr. HEACOCK. Air Coach Transport Association.

Mr. STEFAN. What is your title in that association?

Mr. HEACOCK. President of the association. Mr. STEFAN. How many people do you have in that association?

Mr. HEACOCK. We have 30 carriers in the association at the present time.

Mr. STEFAN. A membership of 30?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEFAN. How many planes do they own?

Mr. HEACOCK. They own from 1 to 10 apiece. I would say an average of about 3 per airline.

Mr. STEFAN. Do they normally own their own planes, or lease them?

Mr. HEACOCK. Both a great number of them own their aircraft and a great number of them lease them.



The big argument that is used against us is that we could not be in business if it were not for surplus transports at cut-rate prices, or if we did not lease our aircraft.

Mr. STEFAN. Have the operations of these 30 members of your association been profitable operations?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. The record has been that?

Mr. HEACOCK. Very profitable. The safety record in the last 2 years—

Mr. STEFAN. I was coming to that. Go ahead.

Mr. HEACOCK. The safety record in the last 2 years since our last accident in July 1949 has been a perfect one. That is in the common air carrier transportation available to the general public.

Mr. STEFAN. What was the record?

Mr. HEACOCK. A perfect safety record. One and one-half billion miles with no passenger fatalities since July of 1949. That is in the common carrier air transportation available to the general public. There was one accident in Florida which was a contract operation not available to the general public, one of the high-ball operations for transporting Puerto Rican workers.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Heacock, what amount of credit do you give to the CAA facilities for that safety record?

#### CAA FACILITIES COMMENDED

Mr. HEACOCK. We gave a very great credit to the CAA. I would like to say that our carriers represent the type of carriers that have survived. There was a sporadic type that would move from one place to the other and use all the pilots they could, and developed a more or less "sloppy" operation. But through the years that type of operation has been eliminated in favor of the competent operator who runs along more or less regular routes, which, of course, is frowned upon by the CAB.

We have had the best of relations with the CAA and the CAA has helped us to establish this safety record by working with our maintenance personnel and working with us at our bases of operation and helping us to establish this record. We are grateful to them for it.

#### OTHER NONSCHEDULED ASSOCIATION

Mr. STEFAN. Is there another nonscheduled association in the country?

Mr. HEACOCK. There is one. It has less than 8 members, however. It comprises those carriers principally who are engaged in the overseas operations such as Seaboard and Western, Transocean, Overseas National, and so forth.

#### REGULATION WITHIN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. STEFAN. How are you regulated?

Mr. HEACOCK. We are regulated out of business.

Mr. STEFAN. No; I am not talking about that. How are you regulated within your association, to keep up a high type of air transportation? Do you have your own regulations among your own members, and are they strictly adhered to?

Mr. HEACOCK. The discipline that we have over our own members is principally being effected now through the military contract work.

Mr. STEFAN. That is temporary.

Mr. HEACOCK. Well, yes; but here is how it works. If we see something that is wrong with a member carrier's operation we can call them to task because they know that we have control over some traffic that is being distributed through the association. In other words, the military deals with the association.

Mr. STEFAN. What standards do you have for your pilots and your engineers and so on?

Mr. HEACOCK. Our pilots all have the airline transport ratings. Individual companies have stricter standards than others. As an example, my own company will not have a first pilot unless he has a minimum of 3,500 hours and unless he has spent a full winter of operation in Alaska.

Mr. STEFAN. You have an age limitation; physical tests and all the other tests that regular commercial airlines have for their pilots and copilots?

Mr. HEACOCK. That is correct. Every 6 months the CAA sees to it that there is an equipment check; that the pilot is checked to see that he is at top proficiency in the type of aircraft that he is operating. Then we have our company check pilots. They are required at least every 6 months to check the other pilots as to their proficiency and bring them up to date. We have our training programs.

Mr. STEFAN. How about the inspection of your aircraft?

Mr. HEACOCK. The inspection of aircraft is handled under CAA regulations. We have CAA inspectors; we have CAA licensed mechanics. We have our maintenance procedures; that is, every 50 hours you are supposed to check these things and every 100 hours you are supposed to check these things. They are the same as for the scheduled airlines and the CAA sees to it that those inspections are carried out.

Mr. STEFAN. Your operators are familiar with the CW communications?

Mr. HEACOCK. We have found no necessity within the continental United States for CW communication. Voice communication is almost exclusively used within continental United States. Overseas operators—yes.

Mr. STEFAN. All the overseas operators use CW or are familiar with CW?

Mr. HEACOCK. I believe such operators as Transocean and Seaboard and Western are familiar with CW operation; yes, sir.

Mr. STEFAN. And are all familiar with the new navigation aids?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Do any of your craft have radar?

Mr. HEACOCK. No.

Mr. STEFAN. One association with which you are not connected you say has approximately eight ships?

Mr. HEACOCK. They have approximately eight members.

Mr. STEFAN. How many ships?

Mr. HEACOCK. They have many more airplanes.

Mr. STEFAN. What would you say is the total number of airplanes in both nonscheduled organizations?

Mr. HEACOCK. I believe the CAA gave the figure at one time—

Mr. STEFAN. Does not your association know?

Mr. HEACOCK. In both associations? No.

Mr. STEFAN. How many ships are there in your association?

Mr. HEACOCK. Approximately 100 aircraft.

Mr. STEFAN. What kind are they?

Mr. HEACOCK. They range from DC-3's, through C-46's and C-54's and a sprinkling of odd types.

#### PERCENTAGE OF TRANSPORTATION HANDLED

Mr. STEFAN. At the outset of the Korean War, what percentage of the airlift transportation was handled by your outfit?

Mr. HEACOCK. Speaking of nonscheduled carriers as a whole, the operators of nonscheduled planes, which represent only about 5 percent of the total lift, performed 45 percent of the Korean airlift.

Mr. STEFAN. Are you taking into consideration the general commercial airlines that went into this service? Or is that your own?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes, sir.

Mr. STEFAN. You are taking into consideration also the commercial airlines?

Mr. HEACOCK. Yes; we are taking them into consideration.

Mr. STEFAN. As between the nonscheduled and the scheduled airlines, what percentage of this transportation was performed in the defense effort?

Mr. HEACOCK. You are referring to the operations between the west coast to Tokyo, called the Korean airlift?

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly.

Mr. HEACOCK. As I say, at the outset, it was about 45 percent. In the meantime, many of the scheduled aircraft that have been relied on were taken out of the airlift, because they cost more to the Government; about 2.25 cents per mile. A C-54, exactly the same as a nonscheduled C-54, would be operated side by side, and one cost the Government 2.25 cents to 2.5 cents per mile and the other nonscheduled would cost 1.75. So, they reduced the scheduled aircraft first and, as a result, I believe the majority of the Korean airlift is now being performed by nonscheduled aircraft.

Mr. STEFAN. Coming down to this bill which you oppose, or this appropriation of \$600,000 for the testing of jet planes on the part of the CAA—

Mr. HEACOCK. I would like to make a little clearer that I do not quite oppose it—

Mr. STEFAN. Do you perhaps fear that the CAA will develop a jet transport plane that will be so effective that it might kill the nonscheduled business; in other words, is there something selfish about your attitude?

Mr. HEACOCK. No. We would jump right into the operation, if it were capable of doing it; no. Just to give you an idea, a jet transport will be operated by Canada, perhaps between Seattle and Tokyo and their fare is \$750. It is possible to take these lower-cost transports and put them into operation and conduct many times the business, for a fare of \$250.

We think that it is not necessary to go in there and knock out that \$750 operation, commercially speaking. What we need is the quantity of aircraft at a lower-cost operation, because jet aircraft is costly to operate; to go into turbo-prop transports and develop the maximum transportation for the least cost.

That is what the Army wants. They do not need a luxury-type transport that will go a couple of hundred miles an hour faster, but at a great increase in cost.

Mr. STEFAN. So you do not oppose experimentation in these jet transports, do you?

Mr. HEACOCK. No; useful experimentation I would approve. I cannot see that experimentation with the B-45 would be of any value. It would just use up the funds that might be used for the development of cargo transports.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand it, Mr. Heacock, you feel that if they start this project by testing the B-45, by the time they get through with that, that will be an obsolete plane; also, they are testing an Army plane rather than a regular transport that could be used for commercial transportation?

Mr. HEACOCK. That is right. Even if I were in favor of jet transport development, I would say that you are not going to get any comparable value out of testing the B-45.

Mr. STEFAN. Suppose this committee disallowed this item, would we be doing something unfavorable to the national defense effort?

Mr. HEACOCK. You certainly would not. You would make more of the funds available for the development of turbo-prop aircraft, cargo-type aircraft. I am very familiar with the work that these people are doing, the CAA. I have worked with them. They are very conscientious people. But the scheduled airlines are looking to getting developed a jet-type luxury transport at comparatively high per-mile costs.



What the Army and what our carriers want to see developed are cargo-type transports which are also useful for passengers at a low passenger rate; get them developed, because that is the crying need. I believe that if the item were disallowed for the testing of the B-45 transport and were used for other purposes—for example, in development of the helicopter, with which Mr. Waldo over here has worked so closely, and which needs extreme attention, because the Army intends to use those as special transports, to transport a squad of men from one hilltop to another; the development of that, and getting it into commercial operation would be useful; but not the B-45.

Mr. STEFAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Heacock. You say the nonscheduled carriers have approximately 100 airplanes. What do the scheduled companies have? How many airplanes do they have in operation—about 400?

Mr. HEACOCK. No. I believe somewhat less than 10 times that.

Mr. STEFAN. I thought at one time they had around 400 in actual operation. I think that we had that figure from you at one time, Mr. Lee.

Mr. LEE. That was back in 1941, I believe.

Mr. STEFAN. And they have increased their active airplanes to how many?

Mr. LEE. Just over 1,000.

#### EXPANSION OF NONSCHEDULED OPERATIONS

Mr. STEFAN. Do you envision an expansion of the nonscheduled operations?

Mr. HEACOCK. I envision a tremendous expansion. You just mentioned 1941. In 1951 the nonscheds alone will be transporting over 1,250,000,000 passenger-miles, which was the total amount that the scheduled airlines transported in 1941, and yet the nonscheds in 1951 are still transporting only 2.8 percent of the passengers and 9.6 percent of the passenger-miles of the entire total.

Mr. STEFAN. What is stopping the expansion of the nonsched operations which you say can be operated at a profit without any subsidy?

Mr. HEACOCK. The restrictive regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. ROONEY. The CAB.

Mr. HEACOCK. They recently put through an order which would have put us out of business entirely. It would restrict us to three trips in any 4 weeks between any two of the major traffic points in the country, such as New York, Los Angeles, Miami, or Chicago.

#### OPPOSITION BY REGULARLY SCHEDULED LINES

Mr. STEFAN. Are the scheduled airlines opposing your expansion?

Mr. HEACOCK. They are bitterly opposing our expansion and are very effective through the CAB by putting numbers of us out of business for alleged frequency and regularity of operation. Many have been put out of business.

Mr. STEFAN. No further questions.

Mr. ROONEY. We thank you very much, Mr. Heacock.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. ROONEY. I yielded the gentleman 5 minutes just a little while ago.

Mr. HINSHAW. Which was very much appreciated by me.

Mr. ROONEY. I did not like the idea of the able gentleman getting ahead of me. I would have yielded him 2 or 3 minutes when his time expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am sure the gentleman would, but I wanted to make certain that I was able to complete my statement.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to ask the gentleman who Mr. Amos Heacock is.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Amos Heacock is the head of the domestic nonscheduled air carriers, the competitors of the scheduled airlines, including the Big Four, that have been the recipients of so many millions of subsidy dollars of the taxpayers' money to keep them in business that it is not funny.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to have time to talk about that at great length. I am sure I could convince the gentleman he is entirely in error. I cannot get the time to do it, however.

Mr. ROONEY. We have discussed the subject on previous occasions and arrived at no agreeable conclusion with regard thereto.

Mr. HINSHAW. Doubtlessly, and that fact I regret.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to return to a discussion of the United States Information Service in the State Department.

Mr. Chairman, I have been greatly disturbed by a recent trend toward careless criticism of the United States Information Service. Frequently we hear that the Voice is a Fancy Dan outfit, that it does not hit hard, that it does not speak in plain language. One critic went so far as to say that the Voice of America speaks with a mumble.

I know that the Members of this House wish to be fair at all times. Indeed, when the national interest is at stake—and let us make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, the national interest is at stake—it becomes the duty of this House to form honest judgment based upon all the facts.

I say this because I am convinced that a fair examination of the output of the Information Service, particularly of the Voice of America does not, and cannot, support these criticisms.

I wish to make some personal observations. I have heard some of the demonstrations of the Voice of America given. I have visited the Voice of America in New York. During the demonstrations there were brought here to Washington and presented for the benefit of Members of Congress and other interested persons, probably these were prepared demonstrations, but I would like to say that in October of 1949 as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I had the opportunity to visit for a very, very brief time in Hungary, as a matter of fact for just a day and a half.

That visit to Budapest was not with any prior information to our mission there. They were not aware I was coming and it was almost by accident that I was permitted to visit Budapest. It was exactly the same time that Robert A. Vogeler was picked up and arrested. I was going to Budapest when he apparently was leaving Hungary. I saw some

of the searching parties that had been looking for him.

It was at that time that I had firsthand opportunity to see the effectiveness of our Information Service. They had fine reception and a great amount of interest by the people in Hungary who had almost to take their lives in their hands in order to seek information about the United States.

I asked some of the people who were at the head of this department in the city of Budapest why they had their offices on the second floor, why they did not have the facilities on the first floor where the entrance would be more accessible. They told me it was necessary that they be on the second floor so that anybody who was trying to avail themselves of information about America would not as easily be picked up by the police of Hungary. They had been doing an effective piece of work. Similarly all of our foreign missions in the satellite countries have been doing likewise. Therefore, I think if we really want an effective United States Information Service we can only have as effective service as we are willing to appropriate money for such service. If we are going to tie the hands or give just a limited amount of money for them to go forward with their work, we can only expect a proportionate amount of success.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Is it not true that the Hungarian Government has just closed our Information Center?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is true, sir, and it points out that the Information Service in Hungary was very effective, otherwise they would not have closed it. Because the Office of Information was an effective piece of work of information and propaganda is the very fact why they closed it.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Does not the gentleman think that that action will be followed in the other satellite countries?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Probably, and for the same reasons.

Mr. CLEVINGER. But it will probably be done in one right after another.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is very true, and it is because they are effective, and I think, because of the fact that they are closing these information services in the various satellite countries, we must give more attention to the Voice of America. The Communists may close the doors of our information centers, they can try to jam the Voice of America and the broadcasts we beam to those countries, but they cannot be as effective in broadcast jamming as their determination to stifle our information centers behind the satellite countries. It is true, perhaps, that there is room for improvement, but whatever program, whatever undertaking, there is room for improvement. The Voice of America has a difficult and complex mission. It seems to give a true picture of the United States and its peaceful objectives.

The Voice has a difficult and complex mission. It seeks to give a true picture



of the United States and its peaceful objectives. It seeks to rally our friends abroad, so that there will be better teamwork among the free nations. It seeks to show those who are neutral that it is in their interest to join the team. It constantly exposes the falsehood of Communist charges against us and the deception in the rosy picture of Utopia put out by the Red propagandists.

I wish that each of us had time to see how this job is carried out—to examine the scripts turned out by the competent professionals who staff the Voice. I have been impressed, and I am sure other Members of this House would be impressed, by the manner in which patterns of psychological attack are selected and hammered home, day after day.

One of these attack patterns calls for exploiting the weaknesses and tensions known to exist in the Soviet Union. I am sure we can all agree this is most important.

Let me call your attention to a broadcast to Russian workers last May:

Dealing with the current economic report from Moscow, the script began by noting that the Communists devote millions of words per year to painting the achievements of Russia and her satellites. Then it pointed out, and I quote:

As time goes on we seem to be getting more and more words—but fewer and fewer facts.

The Voice asked why these reports contained words and not facts. Let me read from the script again:

What are the Soviet planners afraid of? There is only one answer. They must not like the conclusions that have been drawn on the basis of the facts that have been available. Even the scanty facts revealed have led students of the Soviet economy to some rather startling conclusions. One conclusion is that the Soviet worker today, in spite of all his hard work, labor discipline, and continual speed-up, is still far down on the economic ladder. In fact, he has made no advances since 1928—the year when the first 5-year plan was adopted—and in some respects he has lost ground. He still has much less than a worker in any other industrial country of the world—far less than in any one of 17 other countries.

Such conclusions are distracting to Communists. And what do they do when facts and fancy don't agree? Black out the facts of course.

The script then goes into a comparison of living conditions in Russia in 1929 and in 1951. This analysis shows that the average Soviet worker in 1929 could buy six and a half baskets of food per month and that today he can buy only half that much.

The Voice then compared this with the situation of the average American worker, who could buy 12 comparable baskets of food per month in 1929 and today can buy 17 and a half baskets per month.

Mr. Chairman, this script is typical of the job being done by the Voice of America. This is the type of program that has been so freely criticized. Yet it does not seem to me that it pulled any punches. It seems to me that, when you talk in terms of how much food a worker can buy, you are talking in plain language. I do not think you are mumbling when you come right out and say the Russians

are afraid to tell the truth about their own country.

I have here several typical scripts which I think bear out my argument. I shall ask unanimous consent when the Committee rises to insert them in the RECORD, and I would urge the Members of this House to read them, if possible, and to form their own conclusions.

[Special projects, Howard Maier commentary No. 39, July 18, 1951]

#### THE KREMLIN'S NEW PEACE OFFENSIVE

Good evening. This is — —. It's quite obvious to anyone who's been around for the past couple of years that the men in the Kremlin have embarked on a new "peace offensive." Even if you disagree with their evaluation of the naïveté of the people of the world, you have to give them credit for one thing—gall—pure, unmitigated gall.

Their last so-called peace offensive—remember it? The Stockholm Peace Petition—wound up with over 1,000,000 signers of the petition charging into the Republic of Korea, wielding swords, machine guns and tanks. The Soviet peace offensive in Korea—which had such laudable slogans as "push the United Nations into the sea"—didn't work. All the people of the world watched the new prophets of peace as they butchered and burned, and saw that it didn't work. Nothing abashed, the men in the Kremlin decided to change their pace. Malik smiled. Gromyko smiled. And Stalin had a new picture taken of himself receiving a bouquet of flowers from two pretty young girl children. And the new peace offensive was on its way.

Having lost out in the battle of arms, the Stalinists return to their first love: The conference table. Now, the free world has no objection to the conference table, but the Soviets have such strange methods of using such a table. For instance, last November the United Nations Economic Commission under Gunnar Myrdal was trying to explore the possibilities of expanding East-West trade, and, as you know, trade between nations is often the basis for peace. At that time, last November, the Soviets would have nothing to do with a conference table in Geneva. They refused to attend or send representatives.

Why should they? Last November the Soviet peace offensive in Korea was going full swing. Soviet bullets coming out of Soviet guns—held, of course, by Chinese volunteers—were bringing peace to the peninsula of Korea. What did they need with a conference table in Geneva? But, then it was no longer last November in Korea. Old General Ridgway, General Fire Power, had come to personally inspect the credentials of the "peace-loving" Stalinists on the Korean peninsula. It was a rough inspection. The Stalinists didn't like it, and Malik smiled.

And now—the leopard changes its spots. Forget what happened in Korea, says the Kremlin, show us a conference table, any conference table, and we're ready to draw up chairs. Remember that invitation, the boys in the Kremlin say? What invitation, the free world wants to know, there've been so many of them; in fact, we've invited you to anything and everything that might just possibly ease the tensions in the world. Who's talking about easing tensions, the Kremlin says? How naïve can you be? We're talking about that invitation back last November—you know, the one to come to Geneva and talk over expanding east-west trade.

But, the free world says, you refused to attend. Don't be silly, the Kremlin says, that was only a temporary refusal—that was last November when we were bringing peace to Korea. Now, we want to attend. Yes, sir; this is one leopard who changes spots so fast they're practically fluid. Let's take a good look at the spots as they change.

Suppose the leopard was to suddenly appear at this small conference in Geneva. Personally, I don't trust leopards. Besides spots, they have great big fangs. My dear men in the Kremlin—could it just possibly be that your new interest in the expansion of east-west trade might go something like this? The east—that's you and the satellites—sell, say, grain and timber. Naturally, the west—that's us, and mostly western Europe—would have to sell you something in return. And just suppose, my wily friends in the Kremlin, that something in return should be certain products, let us say, products which you made good use of in Korea. In other words, my dear leopard, war materials or the raw material from which war material can be manufactured. Naturally, we would not care to have Western Europe ship you such things—not after your wonderful peace offensive in Korea. Then what would we have—that wonderful leopard wanting to bring necessary things to Western Europe and that bad United States saying it doesn't think it should have them. You wouldn't want to use a conference table for any such purpose, would you my dear leopard?

It's not that we or any other free nation objects to sitting down with you at any table. It's just that you use them so peculiarly. One would have to be a leopard himself to sit down at the leopard's table. For instance, suddenly, recently, out of nowhere, you walked back into the four-power conference in Berlin. Everything was going to be fine. We'd all sit down and work out the economic problems of Berlin. But where were your little leopards all this time? You know, the ones who surround the city of Berlin. While you smiled and were most gracious at the table in Berlin, these little leopards were holding over 6,000 permits which would have allowed Berlin to ship 6,000 truckloads of goods to West Germany. So, in frustration, the west had to suspend the trade talks. Which, of course, gives you the opportunity to say, "Look at those bad, bad men; they don't really want peace."

Ah, well; all I can say is that I'd much prefer to do this kind of phoney maneuvering with you than the kind that takes men's lives in Korea. But please, my dear leopard, when you change your spots put up a larger screen—the spots are beginning to stick out all over your hide—and now, this is — — —, saying good-bye, good leopard rugs for the wall, and see you again.

[Program Services Section, Features Unit, special commentary No. 534, Howe Bancroft, July 18, 1951]

#### LITVINOV AND SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

Maxim Litvinov, once regarded as the foremost Soviet exponent of peace and cooperation between the U. S. S. R. and the democratic world, observes his seventy-fifth birthday this week. The Soviet press has preserved a stony silence on the event, however. Divested of all offices, the former Soviet Foreign Minister and Ambassador to the United States is now living in obscurity.

The long-standing official silence on Litvinov is hardly surprising. Nor is Litvinov's removal from any direction of Soviet foreign policy. The man who once spoke in ringing terms against aggressor nations is sadly out of place in the U. S. S. R. of today. A crusader—or even an apparent crusader—in the cause of peaceful international cooperation could have no possible role in the Stalinist plans for world conquest.

Litvinov is not forgotten in the west, however. He is remembered as the man who pleaded for collective action within the League of Nations to halt the menace of Hitlerian Germany.

He is remembered too as the man who in 1933 issued a famous definition of aggression. The first part of this definition said that an aggressor nation is one that declares war



on another state, invades its territory with armed forces, attacks by land, naval, or air force the territory, vessels, or aircraft of another state, or imposes a naval blockade on another state.

Last August Jacob Malik, the Soviet delegate to the United Nations Security Council, read this part of the Litvinov definition of aggression to the Council in an attempt to prove that the United States was the aggressor nation in Korea. For, said Malik, this was just what the United States had been and was doing in Korea.

Malik, however, conveniently forgot to refer in any way to the remainder of the Litvinov definition. This said that any nation would become an aggressor through provision of support to armed bands formed on its territory which have invaded the territory of another state.

This omission on Malik's part was understandable enough. For the North Korean and Chinese Communist invasions of the Republic of Korea were directly instigated by the Soviets. And, more specifically, these invaders were supplied with arms, training, and other support by the Soviet Union.

He had his audience not remembered the full text of the Litvinov definition, it still must have been clear on Malik's part not to bring Litvinov's name into these discussions of aggression. For, rightly or wrongly, the free world regarded Litvinov as a barometer of Soviet foreign policy. When the Soviet Union wanted to make a gesture toward international cooperation, he was given high authority. And his removal from such authority usually presaged a renewed Soviet policy of aggression, isolationism, and "hate" propaganda against other nations.

It was so in 1929, when the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed. This ran directly against the policies with which Litvinov had been identified and so he was quickly withdrawn as foreign minister before the pact was signed. Later on, in 1941, he lost his membership in the Communist Party's central committee.

But when Hitler invaded the U. S. S. R. he was again brought to the fore. He was instrumental in gaining material aid for the Soviets from Britain and the United States, and in obtaining an alliance with Britain. Just before Pearl Harbor he was made ambassador to the United States. But even Litvinov couldn't get the West to accept all of Stalin's demands, and in 1943 he was removed from this post. He has remained on the sidelines ever since.

Litvinov, however, is more than a symbol or barometer of Soviet foreign policy. He is also a symbol of the exception that proves the rule—an old Bolshevik and devout follower of Lenin who yet survived Stalin's great purges. His escape was not due to any clemency on Stalin's part, however, but to sheer accident.

For during the great purge trials of 1937-38, when his comrades were being mowed down like wheat under a farmer's scythe, Litvinov was foreign minister. In this capacity he was conducting delicate negotiations with foreign powers, and was therefore considered more useful alive than dead. By the time he had finished this work the purge had died down.

He was somewhat more fortunate than such giant figures of the early revolutionary days as Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, and Piatakov. During the purge years they were found guilty of every kind of sabotage, treason, attempted assassination, and disloyalty to the cause for which they had worked so many years. Found guilty along with them were a large percentage of the leading younger Bolsheviks in power at the time of the trials—enough high rank, in short, to staff the upper echelon of any government.

But although Litvinov survived, it is doubtful if any government official ever had

his staff so thoroughly cut from under him as did this Soviet foreign minister. Indeed, when the purge died down in 1938 only two of his men were left—Ambassador Maisky in London and Ambassador Suritz in Paris.

All the others were rooted out. Leo Karakhan, Ambassador to Turkey, was shot. Bogomolov, Ambassador to China; Skvirsky, Minister to Afghanistan; Tikhmenev, Minister to Denmark; Bekzadian, Minister to Hungary; Yakubovich, Minister to Norway; Ostrovsky, who was with the Soviet Legation in Rumania—all were recalled and have now vanished. Stein, Ambassador to Italy, was removed. Alexander Barmine, Chargé d'Affaires in Greece, and Fyodor Raskolnikov, Minister to Bulgaria, escaped abroad.

On what might be called Litvinov's home front the carnage was equally great. N. Krestinsky, his chief assistant, was sentenced to be shot. Gershelman, his private secretary, was arrested. Several other secretaries and translators were seized by the NKVD in Litvinov's own offices. Also arrested were most of the department heads.

These men were replaced, not by career diplomats or experts in foreign affairs, but by members of the NKVD and in a few cases by Red army men. The entire foreign office was brought under the sway of the Soviet secret police—and the enunciation of foreign policy is now in the hands of such men as Vishinsky, Gromyko, and Malik. And a Litvinov who tried to sound like Malik would not be the same man who spoke in the League of Nations in behalf of collective security.

[Program services section, operations intelligence, operations intelligence summary No. 6, Don Shea, July 17, 1951]

#### SPECIAL REPORT: SOVIET DIFFICULTIES WITH SATELLITE HARVESTING

(Documentation will be furnished upon request)

**ANNOUNCER.** The harvesting which is just beginning in many satellite states is already causing the Soviet regime untold difficulties.

Reports smuggled from behind the iron curtain as well as those published by other news sources state that Balkan peasants this year are showing increased resistance to the unceasing Soviet looting of their fields. It is predicted that the situation will become even more serious as the summer progresses.

We bring you now a summary of last week's harvest news from Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

**NARRATOR.** In Bulgaria resisting peasants and harvest workers have contributed largely to the general unrest and violence which have marked that satellite state during the past few weeks.

Reports from inside Bulgaria indicate that peasant resistance is growing, especially against government measures in connection with grain deliveries to the state. In return, according to a report from the Yugoslav news agency Tanjug, Bulgaria 2 weeks ago banned the free sale and purchase of all grain, beans, and sunflower seeds. Bulgarian consumers and producers are now forbidden to transport these agricultural products.

But the real reason behind the order, according to the Yugoslav news agency, was because even the Bulgarian state farms are withholding quantities of their output for sale on the free market.

The Bulgarian Soviets are also severely hampered by the active work of internal resistance groups who have now singled out the Soviet thievery of crops as a current target.

In one of their latest pamphlets—which was smuggled out to the West last week—they bluntly declare:

"The Soviet murderers are trying to disunite the farmers \* \* \* to divide the workers from the farmers. Bulgarians are free farmers and want to remain such. Resist."

And there is resistance.

For example:

Underground groups are reported to have begun setting fire to Bulgarian wheat, much of which has been marked for shipment to Russia. According to Bulgarian refugees in Belgrade, the wheat has been fired with the slogan—"Not a grain of wheat for the Soviet Union."

The harvest news from Rumania indicates that the harvest situation in that satellite state has been the most violent to date.

In Rumania armed guards and militiamen have been placed over every field to curb unrest and assure control of grain deliveries to the State.

But serious disturbances have nevertheless occurred in many localities.

Enraged peasants reportedly killed a militia captain and two militiamen in the village of Piscul, District Gorj. Militia units opened fire on resistant peasants at Afumatz, Stefanesti, and Bolintin. And at Fagarasi three militiamen were killed by farmers who were aided by partisans.

In order to keep news of these Rumanian unrests from the public, it is stated, soldiers needed in Rumanian emergency areas are transported by air to keep the trucks off the roads.

In Rumania, too, the need to mobilize Rumanian peasant women for harvesting is being stressed in an intensive propaganda campaign organized by the Rumanian Democratic Women's Federation which is carrying out "explanatory work among working peasant women."

And finally, from Rumania, comes the officially-announced news that more than three hundred employees of the State-controlled food distribution organization have been arrested on charges of theft.

But this, state recently escaped Rumanian refugees, is not true. The real reason for the arrests, they declare, is because the Rumanian Communist Government desperately needed scapegoats to quiet the population. The people were becoming increasingly resentful against food shortages caused by inefficient collective farm food deliveries.

In Hungary—normally a bountiful, food-laden country—the Soviet regime is extremely worried about the labor shortage for this year's excellent harvest. The Ministry of Food has already officially warned that the enemies of the people are already trying to frustrate the harvest work. The enemies of the people, it is reported, are the independent farmers who are enticing the workers from the cooperatives with bounties of bacon, wine, and brandy.

The newspaper Szabad Nep adds: "We must fight against the private farmers who are seducing the harvest workers." And the workers' newspaper Vilagossag declares: "Members of cooperatives are neglecting their farms to work for private farmers."

Vilagossag continues to state that emergency youth brigades have been formed to meet the labor shortage. And then—with a straight face—it adds:

"The enthusiasm of the youth increased greatly when state security police also volunteered for work as peace guards."

The alarming need for armed guards and militia to keep workers in the fields is seen everywhere in Hungary. And the collaborationist members of the clergy adds their bit by offering church steeples to be used as guard observation posts.

Further—in connection with Hungary's harvest-labor problems—letters smuggled into Vienna from Budapest reveal that much of Hungary's harvest slave labor now comes from the thousands of exiles being uprooted from their homes under the current Budapest mass-deportation program. They are shipped to eastern Hungary to work on collective farms, where they receive little pay



and reportedly live under miserable conditions.

Largest thorn in the Hungarian Government's side, it is stated, are the independent farmers, who continue to hide produce for their own use or funnel it into the free market. But the state-controlled farms are reportedly almost as bad—and certainly wastefully inefficient. In this respect Radio Budapest consistently reports that Communist state farm managers are being jailed or dismissed for bad leadership resulting in nonfulfillment of planned harvest targets.

In Czechoslovakia a worried Ministry of Agriculture has also issued an official appeal asking for public assistance to get in the harvest.

Here, too, the Independent farmers have been plaguing the Communist government. As a consequence the Czechoslovakian Cabinet is urging peasants to spy upon these independent farmers. It especially urges them to watch carefully for evidences of kulak sabotage, or failure to implement delivery obligations. Slovak farmers were also warned by Minister of Agriculture Durlis at a July 10 harvest festival at Velke Uľany to "beware of the capitalistic mentality" of the kulaks.

But despite the warnings, peasant resistance in Czechoslovakia continues to grow.

ANNOUNCER. You have been listening to a special report concerning peasant resistance to Soviet harvest demands in the satellite states. Today's report has included the latest harvest developments from Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia.

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, believing that the eventual solution for many of the world's ills lies in broader education and a common understanding of the problems of other peoples, many of us had great hopes for the Voice of America program. Regretfully, we learn that it has not been satisfactory. If that be the case, and I have no reason to doubt that it is, then we must ask ourselves why this program that could have been so valuable has not lived up to expectations. An answer to that question may be found in the opinions of those who have studied it carefully over past months.

Raymond Moley, the newspaper and magazine columnist, has written a most concise description of the State Department. Mr. Moley wrote on June 28, 1951:

An overwhelming majority of Americans have lost confidence in the State Department, and there must follow from this a general disbelief in what the Department says. It is ridiculous, therefore, to call the voice of the State Department the Voice of America.

Mr. Moley goes on to point out the great damage to our cause from the suspicion directed to the State Department from all sides.

This lack of confidence at home—

He says—

is exactly what the Soviet will use to discredit all propaganda from that source.

Mr. Moley also pointed out the similarity of the Office of War Information during World War II and the Voice of

America at present. Both were attempting to promote wrong policies. During World War II, Moley said:

The more we talked to the people of the enemy countries, the more determined they were to fight to the end. Something of the sort is likely to be true of the present broadcasting of the policies of the State Department.

Mr. Moley was one of the founders of the New Deal and worked intimately with President Roosevelt during its early years. As an Assistant Secretary of State during that period he is not unfamiliar with the State Department. We should heed his warning about the price this country is paying in letting the voice of the State Department masquerade as the Voice of America.

In this country we want and need a true and valid Voice of America program. It is fundamentally important. But, it is also very necessary that it be the real Voice of America and not the voice of the State Department.

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

(Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, in the last few days there have been a lot of attacks and insinuations on the personnel of the Voice of America. Now, it is a good old American custom to present both sides of a question. I do not agree with everything that Ed Barrett has said. I do not agree with everything that has been done by the Voice of America, by the State Department, by the Defense Department, or even by the Congress of the United States. But I do know that Ed Barrett is a friend of mine, and that he has done a good job.

I have visited the Voice of America in New York, and I was amazed at the magnitude and the scope of the undertaking of the Voice of America. I think we must realize that this program just recently started from scratch, and that much has been done even though much more can and must be done. Our criticism should be tempered by the facts and it should be constructive.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say a kind word for my friend Ed Barrett, the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs.

The name of Barrett means a lot to us in Alabama. In case you do not know it, Secretary Barrett's father was for many years editor and publisher of one of our great newspapers, the Birmingham Age-Herald. He was very highly thought of throughout the State.

The present VOA boss was born in Birmingham. He went North to school, but after prep school and Princeton, he came back to Birmingham and began his newspaper career on the Birmingham News.

Alabama lost him after that, but we have followed his career with pride. When he left his job at Newsweek to accept his present post at State we felt Newsweek's loss was State's gain. We

knew he was going to make a success of the new job as he had of the old.

I do not know of any better yardstick by which to judge that success than the increasing venom of the attack being made on the VOA program from the other side of the iron curtain. A man may be known by his friends, but he is also known by his enemies. Secretary Barrett has made some very fancy enemies in the Kremlin gang. I think all of us honor him for those enemies.

However, despite all these attentions being bestowed upon him and his program by the Moscow boys, Secretary Barrett has remained a very modest man. He tells me VOA's mounting success is due to his team, the men and women working under him at State on either the domestic or foreign information program.

I like that in him, but we all know even the best team has to have a good captain to go places. And VOA has gone places. Make no mistake about that. It has gone, and is going, into literally hundreds of millions of homes in Europe, Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, and perhaps most importantly of all, Soviet Russia and her satellites.

Slowly at first, but with increasing tempo over the past year or so, the Voice of America is carrying America's message to the world. Under Ed Barrett's expert generalship the radio, movies, magazines, newspapers, and television are playing their part in this global battle for the minds of men.

This is a new kind of attack for the United States. Russia long ago saw the value of this kind of warfare. She had the jump on us when we got into the game. No doubt about it. Using the technique of the big lie and the little lie—any kind of lie—she had rolled her propaganda batteries into place almost before the smoke of World War II had settled.

It took us some time to wake up. But we did wake. Do not forget that. And our attack, which is founded on truth rather than falsehood, is being effective.

Listen to this. A letter smuggled out from Siberia and received by VOA tells about the punishments the Russians inflict on anyone caught tuning in on the Voice.

But everyone listens—

The letter declares.

The commander of a concentration camp listens, the director of a plant listens, the chairman of a collective farm listens. And if they listen other people do the same or learn from them. People young and old listen. They meet in groups, post guards and later spread the news everywhere.

Ed Barrett has thousands of letters similar to that one.

To me that spells success for a boy from Birmingham and his team. It tells me that they are doing their job.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked Mr. Barrett about the question of information policy guidance on our foreign information program, and I would like to give his reply to the membership at this time.

#### WHY GUIDANCES ARE NECESSARY

When the foreign information program was established in accordance with the United States Information and Edu-



cational Exchange Act of 1948, it was conceived largely in terms of winning friends abroad. The worsening international situation brought about a corresponding change in the information program, placing less and less emphasis on winning friends and more and more emphasis on influencing people abroad. This resulted from a realization that it was not adequate merely to disseminate information in order to increase knowledge and understanding of the United States, its peoples and policies. What was required instead was a carefully planned and skillfully conducted information campaign to foster abroad the attitudes, behavior, and actions which would further the foreign policy objectives of the United States. In the conduct of the program, therefore, the art of informing assumed a role secondary to the art of persuading.

This program is popularly known as the Campaign of Truth. Presenting the truth, as we understand it, means a great deal more than the mere reporting, willy-nilly, of facts. Truth is not only the presentation but also the interpretation of facts and ideas. Although the presentation of facts and ideas often reflects the truth, the presentation of facts and ideas without interpretation can also create false impressions. In accordance with this reasoning the foreign information program not only presents facts and ideas, but also supplements this presentation with an interpretation of their significance in the present world scene. It is this presentation of facts and ideas in perspective which creates the reactions that further the foreign policy objectives of the United States.

In a sense, although the analogy cannot be labored, the foreign information program is comparable to a newspaper. By and large, facts and ideas are presented in the news columns merely for the purpose of informing the public. But in the editorial column of the newspaper these facts and ideas are interpreted according to the policies of the newspaper with the objective of influencing public opinion. However, since the newspaper does not maintain that its interpretation is the only legitimate interpretation, it also publishes by-line columns, plus letters to the editor, which present other interpretations of the facts and ideas covered in the news columns. It might be added that each of these interpretations, however much it may differ from the others, is in the opinion of the writer the truth.

The information program of the United States has its news columns in the form of newscasts, wireless bulletins, and similar material. As in the case of the news columns of the newspapers, these presentations are straightforward and objective. It is, of course, impossible to achieve complete objectivity in the news columns of a newspaper, in a VOA newscast, or in any other news presentation. Different writers select different facts for emphasis, not through design but simply because they see the subject differently. Moreover, the placement of an item in the newspaper or in a radio newscast has a bearing upon its impact.

But the information program, like the newspaper, also has its editorial column in which it interprets facts and ideas in accordance with the foreign policies of the United States Government in an avowed effort to influence public opinion abroad in ways that will be helpful to the United States. This editorial column includes commentaries on the VOA, pamphlets, motion pictures and other materials.

Again, to carry the analogy further, the foreign information program does not present its opinions exclusively but also presents, in round-ups of editorial comment, in reports of debates in the Congress and elsewhere, in speeches and statements, the opinions of many others as well.

The information program cannot present the opinions of the executive branch of the Government alone. To do so would be to create a false impression. It would also negate one of our fundamental—and, to foreign audiences, one of our most appealing—freedoms, the freedom to differ.

For these and other reasons we present as complete a picture as we can but in ways that will achieve maximum gain from what is favorable and minimum loss from what is unfavorable. Determining these ways is a complicated problem that cannot be left to the casual judgment of any person who happens to be writing a script or story or pamphlet. It must be done by experts who understand the techniques of influencing mass opinion, who have a wealth of background information not available to all operators, and who understand the target audiences. But since these few experts cannot prepare all of the material disseminated, their understanding and know-how must be transmitted to the operators. This, in essence, explains the necessity for Information Policy Guidances.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McVEY].

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration today, H. R. 4740, proposes that we spend \$85,000,000 on the Voice of America programs. It is this project in this appropriation bill to which I wish to direct our attention at this moment.

We have been told repeatedly that one of the aims of the Voice of America is to expose communism as a diabolical fraud and to convince the peoples of the world of the superiority of our free democratic Government.

But just listen to this statement that was broadcast by Norman Thomas on the Voice of America on November 16, 1950. Thomas said that communism "is police-state capitalism at its worst." Thomas was asserting that communism is a form of capitalism and that the two, therefore, have a great deal in common.

Mr. Thomas, the leading Socialist in this country for many years, was trying, of course, to disown communism because he is embarrassed by the fact that communism is the Marxist twin of socialism. Thomas was attempting to link communism with our free enterprise system—the system he is out to re-

place. I hardly need point out that it is this same free-enterprise system that the Socialist countries of the world keep coming to beg for aid.

Here is another statement by Thomas on the Voice of America:

I, and all Socialists, would oppose any effort to reinstate Chiang in China.

On that one, Thomas really let the cat out of the bag. This Government's official position is supposed to be to support the legitimate government of China, which is the one headed by Chiang. Yet here are Thomas and the Voice of America telling the world we do not mean it—that we have no use for Chiang's government.

What is the alternative to Chiang's government? Only the Red government that has been making war on us and the other United Nations for 9 months. What has Thomas to say about that Red government? Just this:

No aid or recognition should be extended to Red China or Fascist Spain or Tito's Yugoslavia except under certain conditions, one of which should be a pledge not to try to impose their totalitarian ideology by force upon neighboring lands.

There we have Thomas openly discussing the possibility of handing out aid to the very Chinese Communists who are the sworn enemies of America. All that Thomas requires, apparently, is a promise that the Chinese Reds will confine their killings to anti-Communists in their own land.

I ask the Members of this House to consider the effect of a message like this one on the patriotic, freedom-loving Chinese guerrillas on the mainland, who are daily risking their lives to harass the Communists and bring liberty back to their country. What must they think when they hear the United States Government's official radio berating their legitimate government and discussing the Communists in the friendliest of terms? What must American soldiers in Korea think when they hear the United States Government radio discussing the possibility of giving hand-outs to the Reds?

The Voice of America is not a debating society. It is supposed to be exactly what its title says—the official spokesman for this country, but the people of the United States have shown in election after election that Norman Thomas is not the one they would choose as their spokesman. Norman Thomas is entitled to hold all the Socialist views he pleases; but Norman Thomas is not entitled to promote socialism in other countries on our own Government's radio. Nor is the State Department entitled to assist in promulgating the left-wing line.

Broadcasts such as this cause me to look with suspicion upon the management of the Voice of America. One is constrained to feel that the best service they could render the country would be to resign and let the Voice become the true Voice of America.

What is the difference between communism and socialism? Their end objectives are the same: socialism, communism, naturalization, or whatever



you choose to call it means in the end the same absolute control by a central government and the regimentation of a people.

Now what is the Voice of America? The people of other nations would like to know; they are confused. They cannot understand why we fight communism abroad and protect it at home; they do not understand why we protest so loudly against socialism at home and support it in Great Britain; they cannot understand why we fight communism in Korea and lend aid to it in Yugoslavia.

What is the true Voice of America? It is time we find the answer to that question before we spend another \$85,000,000 in a venture of this kind. The place to begin such action is right here in the Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(Mr. McVEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we have just heard another one of those speeches I have been talking about. I understand that up in the Press Gallery they have a pile of hand-outs this high. Those speeches have been prepared in a certain central place and all directed to various and different points in the Voice of America program. Up to now I think we have satisfactorily answered every one of them. Insofar as the last speech is concerned, I feel that I must point out that Norman Thomas is known to millions of Socialists and labor groups around the world for his courageous anti-Communist stand. Whether we agree with them or not, many of the countries to which the Voice of America broadcasts have important Socialist parties and populations. Some of these people have tended in the past to try to collaborate with the Communists, especially in Eastern Europe. Those are the people we want to get to; those are the people who must be awakened. As an American, and conceding that we do not agree with his socialistic ideas, Norman Thomas helped the Voice of America to do that job.

In one of his broadcasts Thomas made a direct appeal to the North Koreans:

The Kremlin has left us no choice but to meet armed aggression with armed defense. I also want to express my deep and abiding sympathy with the 800,000,000 victims of Communist dictatorship in the Soviet Empire, and with those now threatened by the world-wide Communist conspiracy.

I who tell you this am myself a Socialist. I have been a sharp critic of many things in my own country that I want to change. But no American wants anything in Korea except peace for free people. We want nothing but the end of a war which has caused the needless loss of blood.

Our sons fight for one reason and for one reason only—to stop Dictator Stalin's march to world-wide conquest, using you North Koreans as his dupes and tools.

In another one of his Voice of America broadcasts, speaking as a Socialist, he answered a resounding "No" to the

question "Is America an imperialist power?"

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, what is the situation with regard to the time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has 43 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] such time as he may require.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in assuming that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has sufficient requests for time to consume his entire 25 minutes?

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman have sufficient requests to consume his 45 minutes?

Mr. ROONEY. We do not expect to use the 45 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield some time now?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, for years those of us who have worked to harness one of nature's greatest resources, water, have been attacked by some as promoting pork-barrel projects. But every so often nature takes steps to prove the worthiness of our endeavors. The terrible havoc of floods in Missouri and Kansas last week has eclipsed the writings and voices of those shortsighted opponents to such legislation.

Along the Rio Grande we, too, are faced with the problem of averting the damages of floods. In the arid lands of south Texas dams controlling the water flow serve a multiple purpose. The damages of flood are averted, power is generated, and life-giving powers of water are fully utilized to bring into bountiful productivity some of the country's most fertile soil.

Through the cooperation of the Congress, the Appropriations Committee, and particularly the understanding and help of the able chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], great strides have been taken in this cooperative effort with Mexico to utilize and control the waters of the Rio Grande.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to say to my distinguished friend, one of the ablest Members of the House, in connection with the appropriations for the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, particularly in regard

to the Falcon Dam, that his great interest and convincing advice to this committee with regard to appropriations therefor has resulted all along in past years in the committee going along 100 percent in such appropriations. I believe I bespeak the thoughts of every member of the committee on both the majority and minority sides when I say that each year when we appropriate for the completion of the Falcon Dam we advance sufficient funds so that the progress of the project is not in the least interfered with; and I say this is due in great part to the interest and the convincing advice of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the distinguished gentleman for those very kind remarks. They are somewhat embarrassing, but I enjoy them.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. It is not clear to me from the record and the bill itself, and perhaps the gentleman can clear it up, or the chairman of the subcommittee—Am I correct that this provision for construction on page 9 of the bill is entirely new?

Mr. BENTSEN. No; that is not correct.

Mr. KEATING. The report shows for this item of construction an increase of \$12,700,000 over last year.

Mr. BENTSEN. That is because the construction is in full swing now.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, last year it was just getting started.

Mr. BENTSEN. Yes. The original treaty went into force in 1944 between the United States and Mexico, but the preliminary work of drawing plans and the working out of negotiations with Mexico on a division of the cost has taken this much time.

Since the beginning of my tenure in Congress, funds have been appropriated by Congress which has resulted in the beginning of an international dam at Falcon on the Rio Grande. This is a magnificent example of how two democracies can work together to develop the resources of their country—as the costs and construction are shared between Mexico and the United States.

Mexico has shown even more vision than this country in developing this natural resource. The joint efforts are undertaken under the treaty entered into between the United States and Mexico in 1944.

This treaty provides for additional dams needed to fully harness the river. One of such dams is a small flood-control and diversion dam, costing approximately \$12,000,000, located at the Anzalduas site. The cost to the United States would be approximately \$6,000,000 for its half. In anticipation of the United States completing its part of the bilateral agreement, Mexico has constructed a huge multi-million-dollar gravity canal to the point where the Anzalduas Dam is expected to be constructed. This Mexican canal is scheduled to be completed this month, but as yet the dam which would help control damaging floods and divert the water into the canal for a useful purpose is not built, has not been



commenced, nor even had the money appropriated for it by this country.

Mexico is anxious for its early completion, has authorized it, and has the funds set aside for its construction.

Now as to the main reason for my speech, "Why the United States has yet to fulfill its part of the agreement."

It is my understanding that the State Department has held up granting a favorable report on the project to the Appropriations Committee for its consideration on the grounds that the construction of this small international dam would violate the President's policy generally prohibiting new construction that is not for defense projects. I think that generally the President's directive is a wise policy, but as in most over-all directives there are instances in which it is not only not practical but in actuality does not achieve the objective to which it is directed. In instances such as this, judgment and common sense must be used in exercising such directives.

First, this is not a new construction, within the meaning of the President's directive, but is simply a part of the lower Rio Grande flood-control project and has always been in the plans for that project.

At the joint meeting of the International Boundary and Water Commission between the United States and Mexico in 1932 this plan was outlined in detail. As revealed in the engineering report, the original plan of the lower Rio Grande flood-control project contemplated two diversion dams to divide the floods in the Rio Grande about equally between the two countries so as to restrict the flow in the lower reaches of the river. The original plans for this project were approved by both Governments, except that the Government of Mexico withheld approval of the construction and operation of the proposed diversion structures pending an agreement regarding the division of the waters of the river between the two countries. The treaty between the United States and Mexico dated February 3, 1944, resulted in that anticipated agreement.

Without a diversion dam built at Anzalduas, the floods of the Rio Grande will flow on down the river to a highly damaging extent. Heretofore, these floods have resulted primarily in damage to Mexican lands since the levee system on the Mexican side was not as substantial as that on the American side and was inadequate to cope with these floods. Now, however, with increasing developments in Mexico the Mexican levee system has been improved and strengthened so that floods reaching the river channel in the vicinity of Brownsville, Tex., will damage lands and structures on the United States side as well as on the Mexican side.

Both in fairness to Mexico, in order to protect lands in the United States, and in living up to our contractual agreement, it is necessary to provide the agreed effective diversion of the flood waters before they reach the lower reaches of the river. This can be accomplished only by a diversion dam at

the Anzalduas site. The plan has been modified to result in a substantial saving over the original plan which called for two such diversion dams. Since this was an agreed project with Mexico many years in advance of the President's directive against construction of new projects, it does not come under the new project classification.

Now as to the practical effects of this directive if it is used to delay the construction of this essential dam. It will be injurious to our good relations to Mexico. They have spent many millions of dollars constructing a gravity canal on their side of the river in anticipation of the dam's construction with joint participation with the United States. Furthermore, it is my understanding in any event, even should the United States fail to live up to its part of the contract, and thereby incur Mexico's ill will, Mexico intends to build the dam without United States participation. This is a right which Mexico has under the treaty.

However, if the United States unreasonably delays the construction of the dam and does not participate in it, it will be designed entirely for Mexican irrigation use and will not be available for the use of the United States as a flood-control dam. Furthermore, should the fertile Rio Grande Valley on the United States side decide to construct a similar gravity canal to that which has been constructed in Mexico, they would be unable to use it for diversion purposes and would be forced to go to great additional unnecessary expense by building another dam whereas the one now contemplated could serve both sides and all purposes.

One of the purposes of the President's directive is assumed to have been to curb inflation yet this country, through the Export-Import Bank has already set up a credit for the use of Mexico in the construction of their part of the dam and Mexico has indicated that if we fail to live up to our part of the agreement, they will supplement that sum with sufficient money to build the entire dam. Therefore, whether or not we join, as we are obligated to do in the construction of this dam, will have no effect on the additional money being expended, this country financing the project, and the objective of an inflation curb on this project is nullified.

Another important objective of the President's directive was to save on critical materials yet, since Mexico intends to build the dam in any event, the materials will be used and therefore once again in practice the directive is not effective on this project. Many of the critical materials will unquestionably come from this country.

In summation, if the State Department continues to refuse to issue a favorable report on the project because of its belief that its construction should be stopped by the President's directive against the construction of new projects not pertaining to the defense effort, then the dam will be built by Mexico regardless, we will have failed to live up to our agreement, no critical materials will be saved, inflation will not be curbed, the

United States will finance its construction, and United States tax payers will be denied the benefit of its use.

I have taken this opportunity to address the House to ask their assistance on the project and the assistance of the Appropriations Committee should the Senate decide to appropriate the necessary funds for its construction or should the State Department decide to exercise common sense and good judgment in applying the President's directive on new projects and issue a favorable report on the project.

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

(Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in what the gentleman from Texas has said in regard to the international boundary situation in Texas. We have similar problems in Montana in connection with the boundary between our country and Canada.

In our case the agency concerned is the International Joint Commission. It has jurisdiction over all waters that arise on or cross over the boundary between the United States and Canada.

I often feel that these organizations do not receive all of the support and encouragement to which they are entitled. Their work is not done in the limelight of publicity; nor does it concern matters that make headlines. It is, however, one of the most important contributions that is being made by any agency toward the betterment of relationships between the United States and Canada and the development of resources for the mutual benefit of the two nations.

Much credit for the success of the International Joint Commission is due the Honorable A. O. Stanley, who is chairman of the United States section of the Joint Commission, a former distinguished member of the Senate. His colleagues, Mr. Roger B. McWhorter, of the Federal Power Commission, and Mr. Eugene W. Weber, of the Corps of Engineers, are unusually capable men. They are doing a good job of representing our interests.

In the case of references now before the Commission affecting waters of great importance to Montana, I find that our Commissioners are handicapped to some degree by the fact that the Dominion Government and the governments of the Provinces are pushing ahead with considerable speed on vast new projects to make beneficial use of water resources. Our own program because of the war effort has been so curtailed that we are not able to match the Canadian progress. There is considerable danger that we will find that our delay is costing us the use of some of the waters to which we are entitled. This situation complicates the work of Senator Stanley and his colleagues, but I am able to report that they have conducted the negotia-



tions with great tact and have endeavored to safeguard our interests at all times.

A definite agreement has been made in the Belly-Wharton reference that no new use of the water after the date of the reference will be considered as binding in any way upon the ultimate decision of the Commission. This agreement is good as far as it goes, but the Canadians are far ahead of us in making programs for the beneficial use of the water of these rivers and, if our rights are not further protected, this construction will result in difficulties in the future.

In the case of the Libby project, the Canadians have made unwarranted demands upon us that should be opposed by the American section of the International Joint Commission.

The Commission needs the support of Congress in the effort it is making to protect our rights in these international problems, and I am sure that support will be forthcoming.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I want to congratulate the gentleman. He is the first gentleman on the minority side to walk down to the well of the House today without a mimeographed speech in his hand.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the very able gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] yesterday, in a very eloquent and most informative speech revealed some most enlightening and startling facts and figures on the cost of our American State Department and on its failure to make real progress in the fight against Communist expansion.

The gentleman from Nebraska said yesterday that in 1938 there were approximately 5,000 employees on the payrolls of the State Department. Today, 12 years later, there are almost 29,000 employees in this Department. This is a fivefold expansion in number of employees in a brief 12-year period.

The gentleman from Nebraska pointed out that in 1938 the total cost of operating the State Department was less than \$20,000,000. For the coming year, the State Department has asked for appropriations totaling more than \$283,000,000. The money asked for operation of the State Department during the coming year is almost 15 times as was required by that Department 12 years ago.

Furthermore, between 1939 and 1951, our country has given in gifts and grants to supposed and potential allies in Europe and Asia more than \$101,000,000,000 of American taxpayers' dollars. This is equivalent to \$700 each for every man, woman and child in our country and to \$2,800 for each average family in the Nation.

Most of this give-away program and all of this huge expansion of payrolls and costs in the State Department was done on the claim that it would restrain the expansion of communism.

We, of the Congress, have the duty of inquiring, Has the State Department done a good job with these scores of billions in restraining the expansion of communism? Let us look at the record.

In 1945 there were 179,000,000 people in the world who were under Communist domination. Today, 6 years later, after vastly expanding the payrolls and the spending of the State Department and after throwing scores of billions of dollars of taxpayers' money all over the world, there are 790,000,000 people who are under the control of Russian communism.

This record must force any thoughtful citizen to the inevitable conclusion that our State Department, as now constituted and as it has been constituted during recent years, has made a complete and utter failure of curbing the spread of communism. It has talked much but accomplished little. The more Congress has given to the State Department to spend and the more it has spent, the faster communism has spread and the stronger communism has grown. Surely such a record reveals the record of the State Department as one of complete failure.

Because of this record of State Department failure in the mission to restrain the expansion of communism, the Congress should employ every means at its disposal to express to the President and the country its lack of confidence in the present State Department leadership. Because of the State Department's continued and repeated failures to curb the spread of communism, the Congress should, by its action on this bill, express to the President that the State Department should be reorganized in the hope that under more able and more realistic leaders we can accomplish what the present State Department leaders have failed to do.

There will be amendments offered to this bill which will be designed to express the disapproval of Congress to present State Department leadership. I shall vote for such an amendment because I am convinced that only by a reorganization and thorough house cleaning of the State Department can we adequately protect the security of the American people.

In a critical time such as that in which we now live we must have the best State Department that can be obtained. We cannot afford to trust the security of our people to a foreign affairs leadership which has piled failure upon failure.

(Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

(Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I have a very high regard for the able gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. MACK], who just spoke. He is a fine Representative and he is my very warm friend. But, I am quite surprised that he would charge the State Department with the responsibility of the existence of 700,000,000 Communist

sympathizers in the world today. I do not know what the Republican Party and the Republican Members in Congress expect of the State Department but apparently they expect the State Department to force the thinking of this country on the people all over the world. Well, my friends, I think we have to take stock at home and find out in which direction we are trying to go. We have no right to say to the people of the world that our philosophy is the correct philosophy, but we do have a responsibility to expose them to it, and that is what we are trying to do through the State Department and through our information service.

I would be the last one to say that we must compel people to accept our doctrine. We do not believe in that. We do not compel people in our own country to accept it. You are not compelled to accept it, and to charge our Government with responsibility for the growth of communism is absurd. My friend the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] knows better. But I am glad that he did come down and express his views right out of his heart, rather than from one of these prepared documents.

Seeing Members come to the floor of the House today with speeches that someone has put into their hands, saying, "You go down in the well and say this whether you think it or not. This is what we up in the National Republican Committee headquarters believe, but you say it for us," reminds me somewhat of the Shakespearean play, when Othello threw a big party at his house, and everybody got drunk, and Othello got a little too much to drink. In the kitchen his father remonstrated with him, and Othello seized a butcher knife and killed him. Everybody got excited and fled. There was Othello with his father dead on the floor. He looked at the knife dripping with blood and thinking what he had done in his drunkenness said something like this, "O God, that men should put an enemy in their mouths, to steal away their brains that we should, with pleasance, revel, and applause, transform ourselves into beasts."

These good friends of ours over here are simply letting the Republican headquarters downtown steal away their thinking on this proposition. You get these fellows off one by one and talk to them, and they will not admit that they think the Voice of America ought to be destroyed. They say we need an information service. But by their actions in the House they would kill it.

Let me tell you what you do. You do one of two things, and I say this to my friends on the right side of the aisle as well. You either grant this appropriation for the information service of \$85,000,000 to operate a normal program or, if you do not believe in that, do not offer an amendment to cut it \$5,000,000 or \$10,000,000, offer an amendment absolutely to wipe it out. You must make that choice. You have the right to do that. I think that is what you had better do. You must make up your mind whether you are going to have an information service in this country or whether you are not going to have it.



If you are not willing to pay the price, just destroy it. The country will suffer. The world will suffer as a result of it. But this organized effort to sandbag the information service does not reflect credit on your party or the members of the party in Congress who are trying to kill it.

Our generation has a grave responsibility. We as Members of Congress have a grave responsibility. We have chosen this as a medium for our generation to carry the principles in which we so firmly believe throughout the world. If it fails, it is money well spent. We tried.

I want to caution you about one thing when you try to evaluate this program. When you say it has not done anything, you know you cannot measure the good this program does. You know you cannot go behind the iron curtain to find out how effective it is. You know that to begin with. Yet you say repeatedly here today that it has failed. The net result shows a favorable balance in favor of what we have tried to accomplish.

You will acknowledge that there is not a serious threat in this country to our falling under the domination of communism. You must further admit that Western Europe remains free today as a result of the dollars we have spent and the program we have carried to them, the program of rehabilitation. Yes, it has cost, true enough, but they are free today. England is free, our main bulwark. It is up to us to continue a program that will guarantee that Western Europe shall remain free.

We have not spent much money in Asia. The majority of the money we have spent has gone into Western Europe. I think any fair-minded person will admit, when you consider the fact that production in every Western European country today is higher than at any time prior to World War II, and that their economic life is much higher, that it has paid off. I was there recently. I saw full employment and prosperity. I saw France in a condition that it has not been in in many years. She is one of our principal allies. England has gotten into the condition, as a result of our help, that she voluntarily said, "We shall not ask you for further economic assistance." This has all come about in the brief span of 7 years, since World War II ended. Those are the things that count. There is your tangible proof of what we are doing with our money. It is there and it is indisputable. It cannot be denied. We have accomplished things with it.

At the same time we are doing that we are building a great wall outside of this country which will guarantee to us that the foot of the aggressor shall never be placed on the shores of our Nation, and that our wives and children shall be protected and our homes will not be destroyed as those in Western Europe have been, time and time again.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I wonder just how thoroughly the Republican National Com-

mittee has investigated the background of the public relations men who have written all these canned speeches. It is evidently an organized attempt to discredit the American State Department. My personal opinion is that it plays right into the hands of the Russian Government.

Mr. PRESTON. Of course it does. And this absurd amendment which the gentleman from California is going to propose will be the finest propaganda that Russia could seize upon. If this amendment should be adopted, an amendment which the Supreme Court has already held is absolutely illegal, it will put this Congress in the position of repudiating the Government of the United States in all of its foreign activities. It will completely repudiate our foreign policy, including our entry into Korea.

What do you think our allies in Western Europe are going to say to that, and the small countries in Asia the four countries that recently joined the specialized agencies of the United Nations—countries that have just come into existence. Why, they will say this is a poor nation to follow—a country that will repudiate its foreign policy completely. If this amendment is adopted it means the Congress will repudiate our Government all over the world. That is exactly what this amendment that the gentleman from California plans to offer will do.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], is utterly in error when he states that 790,000,000 people who are under the domination of the Kremlin are Communists. The world knows that millions of these people are not Communists, and someday they will rise against the Kremlin.

Mr. PRESTON. Yes, they are a suppressed people.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. I agree with what the distinguished gentleman from Georgia just said about the proposed amendment that seeks to "get Acheson" but cutting out his salary. For the record, let me say that I do not carry any brief for the Secretary of State. Fact is, I have never been an admirer of Secretary Acheson at all. However, in this particular instance I do not propose to allow my personal feelings to sway my sense of fairness. Now I would not say that the amendment that is to be offered cutting out his salary is a cowardly approach—I had rather be charitable and say it just is not the honorable or proper way to go about it.

A lot of my colleagues here often good-naturedly kid me about Kentucky feuds. Well, there is one thing about us Kentuckians—if we should have our differences—and tempers should flare—and in the heat and passion that might result—firearms should come into play—thank God, the shooting is always done

face to face and not from behind the back. We Kentuckians, yes all Americans, love good sportsmanship and fair play. So if we want to fire at Acheson, let us do it honorably and fairly, but above all, let us do it to his face. Aim at him between the eyes, if you must, but for heaven's sake, let us not be guilty in the House of Representatives of the United States of ambushing the man from the rear. It just is not American. We do not do things that way. For this reason, I shall not support any amendment designed to cut out his salary or to get him by any other means by circumvention, camouflage, or subterfuge.

Mr. PRESTON. A person's sense of fairness would not permit him to do that.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, tomorrow and Thursday will be important days in the history of this country. Our action will have a far-reaching effect, and if you people on this side of the aisle, and some misguided individuals on our side do not take stock of what you are about to do, you are going to do things which will cause irreparable harm—harm that we cannot recover from.

As I said not too long ago to one Member who was speaking, "When you people attack the Voice of America, it is like a young lawyer who is just out of law school and trying a case for the first time, and expecting him to go into court and be a Clarence Darrow." We are new at this business of operating an international propaganda machine and we are going through the trial-and-error stage. We are likely to make mistakes, but we should give them time to develop some degree of perfection. Russia is an old hand at this business of propaganda. She is a past master. She knows the game and has no ethics. It is effective and she gets the results. That is where you get your seven hundred million sympathizers. It is not because of the conduct of America. No country in the history of the world or the history of civilization that has existed for 10,000 years has ever performed the fine acts of charity and altruism that this United States Government has performed in the last 7 years. It will pay off in the long run.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD].

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, what an utterly naive people we are. We are dealing in the United Nations with nations of nationalists, with isolationists, if you please. We are the only internationalist country in the world. Our fellow nations in the unholy United Nations are "gimme" nations. We are just the poor, foolish givers.

Our officials in the Voice of America talk with a feeble, fuzzy language, making a great to-do in the mouthing of mere platitudes, half-truths, or, as we have learned this afternoon, statements by our official speakers that America stands for a world government, that this idea is growing by leaps and bounds in America, or other still worse heresies,



bordering upon out and out communism. Cannot you conceive the huge belly-laughs with which these piffling programs are received in the he-man countries behind the iron curtain? For at the very worst the supposed recipients of these programs are not half men.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in the voice of America. I want to hear the voice of America. I expect to vote for it. But the voice of America I shall listen for will be heard in the thunder of the machines stamping out airplanes. It is going to be heard in the sizzling crash of the white-hot furnaces turning out big guns. It is going to be heard in the measured cadence of marching feet, of our wonderful army of home boys, marching under the Star-Spangled Banner, not any mongrel spider banner of a foreign- and traitor-born ideology, marching only in the defense of our homeland, this beautiful America of ours.

That is the kind of a Voice of America Stalin understands. It needs no interpreter, nor treasonable wolves in sheep's clothing to put it out over the radio, or through a bought and subsidized press.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that when I have concluded what I have to say, no one will be brash enough to rise to the floor of this House and say that someone put words in my mouth. I do not do business that way. What I write and what I have to say I do on my own responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, heavily burdened taxpayers have every right to doubt that they are getting their money's worth out of one of the most expensive subdivisions of the State Department. I refer to the Voice of America.

For that reason, I will read to the House from an article written by John Crosby, columnist for the New York Herald Tribune and other newspapers, and widely recognized as an expert on radio. This year he went to Paris and sent back a report on the Voice of America, writing as follows on May 24, 1951:

As for the Voice of America—

Said Crosby—

It is, according to all evidence, not heard in Paris. That does not mean it is not broadcast in Paris. It is broadcast here (in Paris), but, as I say, not heard. An acquaintance of mine expressed it aptly: "You can always tell when the Voice of America is on the air by leaning out the windows. You'll hear the click of radios being turned off all over Paris."

There you have an on-the-scenes report by columnist John Crosby, a recognized expert on radio and reportedly widely read and followed by the so-called intellectual circles in New York, most of whom look with high favor on the State Department and everything it does.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. When I have finished.  
Mr. ROONEY. I am addressing the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GROSS. I will yield to the gentleman when I have finished if I have the time or if the gentleman will yield me additional time. The gentleman from New York knows that I have only 4 minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want for a moment to turn to the speech made yesterday on the floor of the House by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Yesterday the gentleman gave us a long dissertation on how the Republicans have gone on a hunting expedition with Dean Acheson as their target. Mr. ROONEY says the Republicans started with a blunderbuss and are now using a sharpshooter's rifle. If the gentleman from New York is the hunting expert that he infers he is he should know that the Republicans are making progress.

Out in the Midwest it is the mark of an excellent hunter—a mark of real progress in the handling of guns—when he can shift from a scattergun to a rifle and still hit a dodging, shifty target—such as Dean Acheson.

In his discourse of yesterday, the gentleman from New York said this:

First of all, a hunter obeys the laws. The supreme law of the land specifically says you cannot hunt and shoot an Acheson—or any other similar game—with such a sharpshooting rifle as the hunter has now taken into his hands. He has no license for such hunting.

I assume that when the gentleman speaks of the supreme law of the land he is referring to the Constitution of the United States. I am not aware of anything in the Constitution that sets up a prohibition or in any way compels the taking out of a license by any citizen to freely criticize and compel proper performance on the part of any public official. On the contrary, the Constitution is explicit in its provision for free speech and free press. Nor is there anything in the Constitution that prohibits the offering of an amendment to any bill to come before Congress. Of course, we are all aware that during the past 20 years, and particularly the last 6 years, there has been a growing disregard for the plain provisions of the Constitution.

But getting back to the so-called hunting expedition, the gentleman from New York, being the expert hunter that he is, should know that something more than a license and a gun is required.

The hunter must know whether the season is open or closed on the game which he seeks. The game in this case is a public official and the gentleman well knows that never in the history of this country has there been a closed season on public officials, including Members of Congress, and certainly there is not and should not be a closed season on the present Secretary of State.

Dean Acheson is one of the reasons why the American people are bewildered and confused. They cannot understand

why a Cabinet officer, as thoroughly discredited as Acheson, was not long ago removed from office.

The responsibility rests with President Truman and his failure to act has left Congress with no other alternative than to use the medium afforded by this legislation to compel action that is in the interest of and for the welfare of the United States of America.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, we have but one more speaker. I wish the gentleman would use his time now.

Mr. STEFAN. How much time does the gentleman from New York have, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who hope that we can have a good Voice of America. I know that we do have one, whether we want it or not. That voice is speaking; it is speaking right in this House, Mr. Chairman.

This bill has been under consideration for several months; it has been deliberately delayed from being presented upon this floor for several months. On our side of the aisle questions have been asked in general debate, Mr. Chairman, presumably to be answered by gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. Those of us who wanted to understand this subject stayed here on the floor waiting for the answers. But the gentleman from New York is speechless. Yes; he has prepared this subject much as he might have prepared a rape case in Brooklyn, using that kind of snotty remarks that might be attractive to a jury. No answer has been made to the allegations on this side of the aisle in general debate. We are now at the end of it or approaching the end of it.

The questions raised by the people of this country are not replied to because the gentleman is speechless. There is no answer.

I thank God there is a Republican Party. If that party was not opposed to the Secretary of State and the State Department, unanimously opposed, presenting questions to be answered by the gentleman from New York in his time, I certainly would leave the Republican Party, a party that I joined in 1935 after the "gimme" state started because I knew it should be opposed.

Yes, the voice of America is speaking. It is speaking. Delayed hearings—taking up important legislation when nobody is here—do not debate the subject, make a few wisecracks which part of the fourth estate, kept by this administration, can use in their part of the free press to take half truths and misstatements to a free people. The voice of America is saying these things through the chairman of this subcommittee.

Yes, the voice of America is speaking. The voice of America is writing, if you please. It is writing a great new opera. The gentlemen in this House who think that this Government has not stimulated communism are entirely wrong—they are entirely wrong—because when that opera is finally written there will



be a high chorus chanting, "Gimme, gimme, gimme" and as minority pressure groups, political bribery programs, march over the stage they will chant in a low chorus, "Gimme mine, gimme mine, gimme mine."

Yes, the voice of America is speaking. We have a deceptive one that costs us \$100,000,000 a year, telling the people of Europe who know Stalin does not want war, that we are going to fight. It is this Voice of America, the salaried Voice of America, that tells Stalin he better fight today.

Mr. Chairman, the Voice of America should be telling Europe that if they want what we have they had better look to their governments. They had better define the powers of government. They had better retain to individuals certain inalienable rights that even a "gimme" program by a power-seeking executive cannot take away from them, even if he packs the courts. That is what the Voice of America had better tell Europe, because that is America.

Then we had better tell Europe that we are doing things that they had better not do. That we in this legislative body have resolved that we are going to define the difference between coveting your neighbor's goods as an individual and doing it collectively by groups called unions or political parties.

Mr. Chairman, one of the basic requirements for a good information service is agility. I mean the information service must be able to think faster and act faster than its opposition. If the United States Information Service is to be worth the millions it is costing, it must be able to beat the Reds to the punch when it comes to landing propaganda blows. In these days of instantaneous communication, worldwide opinion may be formed in a matter of hours, even on the most important subjects. Speed and decision should be the watchwords of our information program.

I am sorry that the Voice of America and related activities, as operated by Assistant Secretary of State Edward W. Barrett, are about as agile as a rheumatic rhinoceros. Red tape, lethargy, and inertia are the order of the day. Sometimes it seems that Mr. Barrett's staff is so preoccupied with writing lengthy interoffice memos and with fussing over trivial housekeeping details that they have little time left for anti-Communist propaganda.

For instance, an article in Pathfinder magazine of May 16, 1951, cited the following typical example of how the Voice operates:

An expert proposes a new program for the Campaign of Truth. The idea goes to Charles M. Hulten, general manager of the Voice. Hulten relays the idea to Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs. Barrett sends it to James E. Webb, Under Secretary of State. Webb sends it to a committee. The committee sends it to Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson. Then, if the idea is approved, it follows the same route back. Frequently, by the time it reaches the desk of the man who is to execute it, it is so out of date as to be completely useless.

Another instance of bureaucratic slowness is the fiasco of the proposed build-

ing purchase in New York. Last August State Department officials appeared before the House Appropriations Committee with an urgent request for funds to buy a building in New York. They testified that such a building was sorely needed in order to consolidate their scattered operations, and they promised they could move within a month or two after the building had been acquired. The State Department witnesses emphasized that the Voice operation was being badly handicapped through lack of proper facilities.

The committee accordingly appropriated \$3,000,000 to meet the emergency. Yet today, almost 1 year later, no building has been acquired. No wonder the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] called this building situation a "confounded ridiculous comedy of errors, or amalgamation of stupidity and negligence and dereliction of duty."

If the present Voice of America cannot unwind its own red tape with \$3,000,000 in hand and over a year in which to find a place to hang its hat, how can it match wits with Reds in a score of countries around the world?

Still another shocking example of Voice of America fumble-bumbling is found in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee. This one concerns purchase of radio receivers to be given away free to potential—and I use the word "potential" advisedly—Voice listeners in foreign countries. In July 1950 Voice officials told an Appropriations subcommittee that this was an emergency project, and they assured the subcommittee that the receivers could be delivered in about 3 months at the rate of 20,000 a month. The sets were to cost \$15 each, and \$2,694,000 was made available, or enough to buy 179,600 sets.

But at the time appropriations hearings were held early this year, the only progress on this so-called emergency project was a trial order for 2,750 sets that had been placed on December 6, 1950, by which time the price had risen to \$35 a set.

A committee investigator attributed the delay to administrative dawdling. He continued:

The files disclose that there was considerable shifting of responsibility for the project. Responsibility for various phases thereof was parceled out to several individuals, and there was no one individual held directly accountable for insuring that whatever obstacles existed were expeditiously handled so that invitation to bid could be promptly issued.

And that is how the State Department is waging psychological warfare.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] commented as follows regarding the increase in price to about \$35:

My constituents would think I was becoming senile if I were to go for \$35 a set.

I will cite just one more example. In the 1950 supplemental appropriation, there was included an item of \$10,475,000 for construction of six new broadcasting stations so that the Voice could pierce the iron curtain. This project, like many others, was represented to be an emergency. Yet when Charles M. Hulten, general manager of the State Department's information and education ac-

tivities, was testifying on March 8, 1951, he admitted that not a single one of these stations has been completed. In fact, the slowdown was so bad that the National Security Council had to step in during December 1950 and tell the State Department to hurry up and get the stations built.

No one is more eager than I for an effective Voice of America, but the instances I have described make clear that the Voice as now managed and operated has a mouth full of red tape and barely reaches beyond the confines of Foggy Bottom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from California in his remarks—just now made—and I was not listening intently at the moment because I was conferring here at the committee table—stated something about my defending a rape case in Brooklyn. Let me assure the gentleman and this House that I have never defended a rape case in Brooklyn or anywhere else, but I have prosecuted many rape cases in Brooklyn and I will prosecute vigorously insofar as I am able any case wherein the rape is against the integrity of the United States of America.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] to close the debate on our side.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, the Voice of America will always be what the people of America and particularly the State Department makes it. You cannot have an effective Voice of America unless you have an effective State Department with effective, honorable, and most of all, consistent policies.

Let me ask you in all sincerity this question: What can the Voice of America say, for instance to the people behind the iron curtain, when we have a State Department that endorses the risk of 150,000 war casualties in Korea, and at the same time the same State Department refuses to take any action and pays ransom, in fact, to the Communist Government that they have in Hungary in order to get a man like Vogeler free? What can the Voice of America say to the freedom-loving people of the world when we have an inconsistent policy, where we are willing to risk more than 150,000 war casualties in Korea and yet countries behind the iron curtain incarcerate American citizens, imprison them, and there is no protest whatever and no effective action taken by the Department of State? Any voice coming from the State Department or any voice coming as regards the defense of the United States of America in regard to that inconsistent policy would have no effect throughout the world whatever. What is it that the Voice of America can say, for instance, to the people behind the iron curtain in Poland? What is it that the Voice of America can say about that government that they have in Poland? Was it not the Government of the United States at Yalta that helped es-



establish that government? Was it not the Government of the United States that helped formulate the government that they now have in Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, part of Austria, and Hungary? How we must look to the eyes of the world when we at Yalta met in conference with two other men who set themselves up above God and set up a government which brought communism to them. Is the Voice of America now to say: "Do not believe that government that we set up for you. Overthrow that government that we set up for you."

I feel sorry for Mr. Barrett. It is the last job I want to have as head of the Voice of America, to keep up with the gyrations and the inconsistencies of the present Department of State. One would have to be more than a genius in order to organize and manipulate an effective Voice of America.

For instance, how can the Voice of America justify three different positions that we had in the last 5 years in Korea? How could the Voice of America sell any one of those three policies to the world? How can the Voice of America justify to the world the three different policies that we have had in the last 5 years regarding Korea? How can the Voice of America, for instance, justify, just a few months ago, where the Department of State was saying that Franco was a dictator; we do not want to do business with Spain, and now we do business with them? Now, what kind of a Voice of America would we have if it attempted to keep up with gyrations from one day to the next of our State Department?

I feel sorry for Mr. Barrett. He has an impossible task to perform. You cannot have an effective Voice of America until you have an effective and honorable Department of State that stands for one thing throughout the world, and only one thing. How can the Voice of America, for instance, justify our State Department's attitude of the last 5 years regarding Yugoslavia? First we were on the side of Mihailovitch and then on Tito's side, then Tito murdered five Americans in cold blood and we were against Tito. And now we are handing out millions of dollars to Tito. A man would have to be a pretty smart circus performer to keep up with the State Department and the Voice of America and justify those policies throughout the world. It is an impossible task for the Voice of America to perform, and the Voice of America is admitted by everybody not what it should be; it is not effective, and many contend that the Voice of America today is useless, not because of the operation of Mr. Barrett as a person but because of the inconsistent, ineffectual, and dishonorable policies set up by the State Department which no human being, no matter whether he was a centipede or whether he had 15 different faces, could interpret to the world honorably and justly. It is humanly impossible for any voice to interpret what the State Department stands for throughout the world today. There can be no real Voice of America until there is a heart and brain for America. A voice can be only as strong

as its heart and brain. A voice cannot be one thing and the heart and brain of a nation another thing. Our task is to formulate a real heart and brain for America. The Voice of America we can all be proud of will naturally follow. That is the task before us. To accomplish less will be a miserable failure, and the Voice of America soon will not even be a peep.

We criticize America's voice. How unfair. How can America have any voice when our State Department permits its visas to become mere scraps of paper? How can our Nation's voice urge others to resist when we have a State Department that has no guts itself to resist? We have no voice because we have no heart, guts, or brains in our State Department. That is why we are losing and Russia is winning.

(Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers on this side, but before concluding the debate on this side of the aisle I want to take this opportunity of thanking the chairman of the committee for his courtesy during this debate.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] to close debate.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, closing this debate is a distinction which I do not merit, but one which I will try to fulfill to the best of my ability.

In hearing the debate which has taken place we have heard a number of things about the State Department and the Voice of America which I should like to comment on and which I think are important for us to think about. First of all, with regard to the State Department, it has been charged that it has had inconsistent policies. Obviously, as times change there must be change in policies, providing that the fundamental policy of freedom under God and the fundamental principles upon which our country is founded are carried out. Naturally, each circumstance must be met with the particular weapons which may be available at that time.

It avails very little for us to say, "In Korea we waste thousands of lives because of a particular policy and then in another place we may offer some sort of a reward for the return of a particular individual," without offering some solution ourselves as to what we would like to see done. What would those who criticize have done in Korea?

If I remember correctly, there has not been a thing that the President has done that has met with more popular acclaim, when he did it, than his declaring that we would go into Korea. That certainly was a popular thing when he made that decision. Where were they, then, when that decision was made?

As far as the release of Vogeler and people of that kind by the payment of some sort of recompense is concerned, we are all sorry that the payment had to take place. But they did not have to shed American blood to get him back. If

he could be gotten back in a simpler way, without embroiling people in armed conflicts throughout the world, that ought to be done. So I think they ought to be careful in the things they hurl at the head of our Government today. It is a time when he needs assistance, not disunity.

With regard to the removal of the Secretary of State, I am sorry people have taken the position that it would be a good idea to cut off funds to achieve his removal, because I do not think that is a constitutional method. The forthright method is to bring impeachment proceedings against him. That is the way in which Congress can do it openly and forthrightly. The President has the authority and responsibility to employ the Secretary of State. The constitutional authority of the Congress is impliedly limited to impeachment. Cutting off salary funds in this bill would not accomplish the stated purpose of eliminating the present Secretary of State because there are ample emergency funds with which the President could continue the salary. Removal of the Secretary by such a backhanded method, if it could be done, which it cannot, would give comfort to our enemies by making possible an impression that there is dangerous disunity in our country. In certain ways we are not unified. I certainly differ greatly with Secretary Acheson, probably at least as much as anyone in this Congress, but I believe in upholding constitutional government and I believe that the drastic action proposed would do our own country far more harm than can be readily visualized. Whatever disunities may exist among us, there is certainly no disunity so basic as must be implied in a movement of that sort.

In the battle for men's minds and hearts the democracies have one most potent ally—the spiritual nature of man. It is this thing I want to talk about, chiefly in concluding my remarks.

The Communists know this. They have used and are now using every weapon at their command to convince the masses behind the iron curtain that spiritual values are unimportant.

Radio Moscow on June 11, 1948, declared, "There is no place or job for God in the universe."

Such is the Communist philosophy. It has been so from the beginning. Back in 1903 Lenin said, "We must know how to combat religion." I do not need to go into details as to what the Communists have done to combat religion, to try to prove to their people that there is no place in their universe for God, but I am willing to wager that their campaign has not been successful. There must be hundreds of millions, certainly millions, of people behind the iron curtain who know that such a philosophy is false and destructive of human welfare. There are many there who hunger for religious freedom and for the opportunity to worship God and live under and by spiritual principles.

Potentially these millions are powerful allies for the democracies. To reach them we must build a bridge over which our spirits can meet. I believe that the Voice of America is building that bridge.



Through its religious broadcasts it is establishing common bonds between these spiritually hungry millions abroad and our own people.

I have made a study of the Voice of America's religious broadcasts and have come to the conclusion that they are doing a good job. It has been explained to me that the policy behind these broadcasts is threefold.

First, to feed these spiritually hungry people through messages from religious leaders and through special services on religious holidays.

Second, to spread the doctrine of freedom of worship.

Third, to emphasize the fundamental challenge of the world today, the issue of spirituality versus materialism.

There are many ways in which they have carried out their efforts. For instance, the Voice has given full news coverage to the persecution of religious leaders in the various satellite countries. For example, the true story of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty has been told not only to the people of Hungary but to the people of the world. Throughout the period of the cardinal's arrest and trial the story was given a major play in all VOA broadcasts. These broadcasts were effective. Minister Chapin cabled the VOA at the time:

Hungarians were brought to tears by the programs \* \* \* listened on their knees, praying for the cardinal. This is an indication of the accomplishment of our fundamental objective, namely to make them feel they are not alone and abandoned but are still part of a spiritual community with the west.

The fury of the Hungarian Communist regime over the broadcasts was, in itself, a tribute to the programs. Through the controlled press and radio the VOA was bitterly attacked for making a martyr of the cardinal.

The case of the Hungarian Lutheran clergyman, Bishop Ordass, the arrest of 15 Protestant pastors in Bulgaria, the persecution of Archbishop Beran in Czechoslovakia, were given similar treatment.

The Voice does not, of course, confine itself to this type of broadcast. I understand that there are weekly programs, both in English and foreign languages, devoted to religious subjects. The various religious holidays and events of religious importance are given special attention. This spring, VOA invited representatives of the Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant faiths to become members of a religious advisory panel which meets regularly with Edward Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, to discuss and arrange programs.

Commenting on these programs an article in *Presbyterian Life*, April 14, 1951, says:

The Voice of America has become the champion of religious freedom in the iron-curtain countries.

The joy these programs bring to the listeners is told in stacks of letters received from practically every country penetrated by the Voice. A woman from Berlin, for example, wrote:

Your Easter program was the best yet. This was an unforgettably festive hour for

me and my husband. This full measure of love and kindness brought tears to our eyes. It is a great consolation to know that the American people remember us.

This is the spiritual bridge the VOA is building. In my opinion, it is a bridge we should expand and strengthen to the limit of our resources.

So, in conclusion I think, instead of trying to snipe at the program we have before us, we ought to be doing everything we can by appearing before the committees and coming down here in the well of the House and conferring with the Secretary of State and in every other way doing what we can to strengthen the program, and not destroying it and our country as well. Where the Department needs our assistance, I think we should give it every bit of assistance we can; and we can do it by strengthening the Voice of America and the State Department at the same time.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

(Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad if the debate were to close upon the high moral note just sounded by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]. And I would not take even these few minutes except that something that was said in general debate that requires a comment.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. VAN PELT] did not have time to conclude his remarks in criticism of Mr. Raymond Swing, but since I know Mr. Swing, I feel impelled to make this statement in his defense. I am sure the Voice of America should not be criticized for employing such a distinguished broadcaster. Mr. Swing's broadcasts during the war were sponsored by the Socony-Vacuum Co. He has received recognition in such periodicals as *Reader's Digest*, and the *Saturday Evening Post*, and as an acknowledgement of his great service to our country, honorary degrees from Harvard University, Oberlin, Lafayette, Williams, Muhlenberg, Olivet, and other colleges. These institutions certainly would not honor one whose loyalty could be questioned.

Whether one agreed with Mr. Swing or not with reference to his hopes for disarmament, one must recognize that he has vigorously opposed any disarmament by our country until the dangers that are here have vanished.

The article by Mr. William Henry Chamberlain, I believe, which criticizes Mr. Swing, was based upon an article which Mr. Swing wrote in 1945. It was based upon the possibility of a general disarmament. And since that time, of course, it is apparent that Russia is determined to continue a policy of aggression. There is no question in my mind about Mr. Swing's loyalty and his patriotism nor the soundness of his view that disarmament cannot take place as long as Russia's present policies prevail. He has repeatedly made clear his conviction that the United States must not disarm under these conditions.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read down to and including line 6 on page 1.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST) having assumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## TWO HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF DETROIT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the beginning of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary celebration of the founding of Detroit. In observation of that event, I ask leave to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an article entitled "Miracle in Michigan" which appeared in the February issue of *Town and Country* magazine. It is written by one of the country's ablest writers, Mr. John C. Manning, editor of the *Detroit Times*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

## ONE WORLD—ONE FLAG

(Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that a great majority of the American people were astonished this morning when one of the local papers carried the news that General Eisenhower is advocating one army in Europe under his command, with one flag and one kind of uniform for all the North Atlantic Treaty Organization troops. I am wondering by what authority General Eisenhower assumes unto himself the right to make any such recommendation. Has it the approval of the President of the United States?

Here again we see a rather subtle effort being made toward one world, one government, all over again.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that if the press report is true, and is not denied by General Eisenhower, he has definitely taken himself out as a Presidential candidate.

Mr. Speaker, the American soldier fights for one flag only, and that is the Stars and Stripes of the United States of America. The recommendations by General Eisenhower, if true, is a disservice to our great country.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the



RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include an editorial from the Dallas Times-Herald.

Mr. LESINSKI and to include an article from Inside Michigan.

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. GOSSETT.

Mr. HALE and to include an article on the Defense of the Dollar.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho and to include an article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include an article by David Lawrence mourning the death of Admiral Sherman.

Mr. DONDERO.

Mr. BURDICK and to include a table on the falling of farm prices.

Mr. GOLDEN and to include an article.

Mr. TOLLEFSON and to include an editorial.

Mr. BEAMER and to include a news letter.

Mr. JENISON.

Mr. LARCADE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TABER to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include three letters from the State Department, and a memorandum and certain newspaper clippings.

Mr. RANKIN on the necessity for speeding up establishment and construction of a Missouri Valley Authority and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK and to include a letter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include tables.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. STEFAN) and to include a letter.

Mr. PHILLIPS (at the request of Mr. STEFAN).

Mr. SCUDDER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include a newspaper article.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY to revise and extend the various remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI (at the request of Mr. ROONEY) to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mrs. BOSONE.

Mr. GRANGER and to include a broadcast by Charles Collingwood.

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous matter.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 76. An act for the relief of Herbert H. Heller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 83. An act for the relief of First Lt. James E. Wilcox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 100. An act to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 121. An act for the relief of Tryntje Bierema; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 269. An act for the relief of Nicholas Papaconomou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 302. An act to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 426. An act for the relief of Teruko Okuaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 462. An act for the relief of Rosita Anita Navarro and Ramona Alicia Navarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 509. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act of March 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 451; U. S. C. 718d), as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 537. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 810. An act for the relief of Howard I. Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 880. An act for the relief of Ann Lampugh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 950. An act to amend the act authorizing the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes of the Wind River Reservation for the purpose of extending the time in which payments are to be made to members of such tribes under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1028. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lou Wong Shong Ngon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1133. An act for the relief of Sophie Strauss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1146. An act to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1166. An act to create a commission to make a study of the administration of overseas activities of the Government, and to make recommendations to Congress with respect thereto; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1279. An act for the relief of Davis Min Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1345. An act to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1349. An act to establish a Department of Food Services in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1365. An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1390. An act to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1403. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer to the Department of the Navy certain property at Shumaker, Arkansas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1474. An act for the relief of E. O. Browder and Charles Keylon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1562. An act for the relief of Harvey Marden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1704. An act to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of

vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 25, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

630. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated November 16, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States of Displaced Persons, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

631. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

632. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore leave purposes only, of alien seamen, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

633. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Horatio Nelson Verchids, file No. A-5657849 CR 31090, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those now before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

634. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, approved July 1, 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

635. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for permanent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

636. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a reconnaissance report on the potential development of water resources in the Territory of Alaska, pursuant to a provision of the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 197); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk









places from whence communism springs and the basic conditions which predispose American citizens to acceptance of the Communist doctrine. The slums of our large cities, Mr. Speaker, provide the most fertile breeding ground for the virus of communism. These people who see all about them nothing but squalor, filth, suffering, and ignorance naturally do not highly regard nor deeply revere the great free society which is the United States. For them the Constitution and the Bill of Rights have no real meaning. For them the "four freedoms" seem but a hollow mockery. Some of them believe that there is a fifth freedom: the freedom to suffer. Naturally Communist agitators, with their glib promises of a bright future, of improved conditions, and of assistance and equality find an attentive and a sympathetic audience. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the appropriation called for in this bill for public housing is a much better investment against Communist infiltration in the future than any sums ever spent by either House of Congress in investigating communism in America.

There is also a question of good faith involved. Prior Congresses have authorized public housing and provided appropriations. In reliance upon this such groups as the St. Louis Housing Authority have been set up. For the next fiscal year the St. Louis Housing Authority has plans for 4,488 units. Through private funds, tax exemptions authorized by the State Legislature, and the Board of Aldermen of the city of St. Louis, and other statutes, the St. Louis Housing Authority has proceeded to acquire large sections of land in the blighted slum areas of St. Louis. It is contemplated that in the next fiscal year enough land will be acquired to construct 1,312 units of public housing, bringing the total for the first two years of the construction program to 5,800. Thus far, the Public Housing Authority has approved the 1,522 units. Architects' plans have been completed for the balance of the program. The St. Louis Housing Authority has purchased land of a value in excess of \$500,000. Options have been obtained on the balance of land which will be required for the completion of this program.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot break faith with such groups as the St. Louis Housing Authority at this time. I feel certain that it is not the intention of this Congress to abandon public housing. In order successfully to complete public housing programs, however, it is necessary to have the cooperation of semiprivate agencies such as the St. Louis Housing Authority. They, of necessity, must make plans. This involves continuity of the program by the Congress. To speak in terms of 5,000 units for the entire Nation is palpably ridiculous.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I will support the conference report on this bill. The bill now before us provides for a total of 50,000 units of public housing to be built during the fiscal year

which began on July 1. This matter is one of considerable controversy, but I feel that the conference report in providing 50,000 units deals fairly with the question.

When we passed the Housing Act of 1949, it is my recollection that we provided for the construction of 130,000 units of low-rent housing per year for a period of 6 years. Thus a cut from 130,000 to 50,000 units is a cut of 61 percent, and I dare say that no Government program has been cut by such a large percentage. If we build 50,000 units this year that will only be 39 percent of the number that we originally provided for this year.

I say the conference report in providing for the construction of 50,000 units this year deals reasonably fairly with the question, because we all realize that all programs of the Government except those dealing directly with the defense of the Nation must be curtailed to some extent in order to more nearly reach a balance of our budget.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are those here, who argue that the number of low-rent housing units to be constructed during this fiscal year should be cut to 5,000 units. What these Members mean is that they would like to kill the public-housing program altogether. I am against reducing the number of units to 5,000. It is grossly wasteful, as I see it, to carry on the program at all if only 5,000 units are to be built. What does 5,000 units mean? It means the construction of an average of 11 units in each congressional district during the next year. If the program is to be restricted to 5,000 units, the cost of administration will be out of all proportion to the benefits received.

All across the country these housing projects have been approved. The preliminary work on them has been done. The Government has paid the cost of planning. Sites have been selected, and in many cases acquired. Architects have drawn the plans. Condemnations of land have been made. Accountants have set up the books. Many of the projects are ready to build. To fail to build those already approved seems to me to be folly. It is the type of irresponsibility that many people are already saying they can expect from this Congress.

Slum clearance is a subject that we have heard much about during the past several years. If slum clearance is to go forward under the Housing Act of 1949, then we must necessarily build enough public housing for those people who are dispossessed in the slum-clearing process to live in temporarily.

Low-income people, such as those who live on small pensions, those who have physical handicaps that prevent them from earnings as much as the more fortunate ones among us, disabled veterans dependent upon veterans' pensions, cannot pay the high prices that individual homes are selling for today. In our hurry to make headlines, let us not forget these people. Our Government cannot afford to forget the needs, the aspirations, the hopes of any segment of our people.

# STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4740, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read the first paragraph of the bill. If there are no amendments to this paragraph, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

## TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Department of State not otherwise provided for, including expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 2870, 287q, 287r); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of aircraft outside the continental United States; printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of uniforms; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by contract, for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; establishment, maintenance, and operation of passport and despatch agencies; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; ice and drinking water for use abroad; excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; loss by exchange; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; relief, protection, and burial of American seamen, and alien seamen in foreign countries and in the United States Territories and possessions; expenses incurred in acknowledging services of officers and crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing American seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or other catastrophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining in Egypt, Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court, and care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical information, (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids, (4)



maintenance, improvement, and repair of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries, including minor construction on Government-owned properties, (5) fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad, and (6) rental or lease, for periods not exceeding 10 years, of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for the use of the Foreign Service, for which payments may be made in advance; \$75,500,000: *Provided*, That not less than \$10,000,000 of this appropriation shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 201 (c) of the act of June 30, 1949 (41 U. S. C. 231c), passenger motor vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available without fiscal year limitation for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not exceed \$3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission and \$1,400 in the case of all other such vehicles except station wagons.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 4, line 4, after the semicolon strike out "\$75,500,000" and insert "\$73,000,000."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer seeks to reduce the amount of \$75,500,000 allowed by the committee for salaries and expenses in the Department of State. It will be recalled that the Foreign Service budget has been placed under the salaries and expenses of the Department of State. Previously the Foreign Service budget appeared in the bill separately, and in that way the Members had better opportunity to see what the cost of the Foreign Service was as compared to the staff here in Washington.

The reason for my offering this amendment is because I have for some time believed that we should look again into the reorganization of the Foreign Service. I believe we should go into that matter some time in the future and have another look at it. However, the amendment I offer I am positive will not injure the operations of the Department in view of the fact that about \$3,000,000 of these funds are transferable into other agencies, and in view of the further fact that there has grown up here in Washington too many divisions of the Department. I sometimes wonder whether or not we should have as many divisions in the Department of State in Washington. We have one section in these divisions having relations with Congress. I was quite amazed as my chairman himself when the item came up before us, indicating that he had not seen one of those representatives, any one of the 27 employees who had relations with Congress.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman feel that the action of the committee in reducing this bill by the amount of \$1,900,000, and the expression of the committee during the hearings with regard thereto is sufficient

evidence as to what the committee wants done with regard to those 27 employees?

Mr. STEFAN. I agree with the gentleman, of course, and he knows and I know that the amount allowed for the department was satisfactory to it. We know that there is room enough to make some retrenchments here. I am alarmed over the fact that our national debt is increasing tremendously. I was told the other day that with all of our obligations and commitments, we have now a national debt approaching \$300,000,000,000. We have a big tax bill coming up, we have a demand from our constituencies to economize.

I repeat again, I am offering this amendment in good faith. It is a modest cut and I believe this particular agency can take the cut that I am suggesting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the cut in the Department of State is apparently a large one, but if you will look at it, practically all of the cut is made in the Voice of America or in the International Information Service. We cut that \$40,000,000. There is an apparent cut of \$30,000,000, but in actuality we cut it \$40,000,000. So the cut I am suggesting in this is merely a cut which I believe will put the Department on notice to do some retrenching in connection with their Washington divisions which are growing like mushrooms and which are costing a tremendous amount of money.

I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment conclude in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment really does not reduce the funds that were available last year to any extent. If the chairman of the committee will turn to page 11 of the committee print—and I call the attention of the membership to it—there is no such thing available to the membership generally—there is this footnote to the budget:

Excludes \$3,779,732 for activities transferred in estimates to other appropriations as follows.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I referred to that.

Mr. TABER. I know the gentleman did, but I want to give the details so that the House will see what it is and also that this is only a cut of about \$400,000

below the amount made available last year. That is the actual situation. The actual cut here is only about \$400,000 below the amount that was made available last year. Why they should object I do not know.

The way the committee has brought the bill in here, with the reductions it has made, this is more money than they had available last year. Under these circumstances it does not seem reasonable that we should allow it to stand.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman know that the comparative figure with last year's appropriation is \$2,992,000,000 less, as pointed out in the report? Furthermore, may I respectfully point out that the committee at page 3 of its report specifically referred to the item appearing in the footnote at page 11 of the committee print.

Mr. TABER. If you take \$3,799,000 out of this figure you get \$73,701,000. That is the way the thing stands. With the transfers, it is not a substantial cut below last year's figure, and we should not allow the thing to stand. Those are the 27 persons who are on the payroll who draw at least \$15,000, if they are liaison men, who come up here to operate on Congress. I think the gentleman from New York said he had never seen one of them when they held hearings. Now, it does not seem to me, when we are asking to make a cut of \$600,000 below last year's figure, that we are asking for very much of a cut, everything considered.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will adopt the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the last matter mentioned by my distinguished and able colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the matter of the 27 employees engaged in congressional liaison, permit me to point out that that was brought to the surface by this committee. There is contained in the printed committee hearings a full explanation, as best they were able to give it, of what work they do, and that matter has been amply taken care of by the committee in reporting the amount of \$75,500,000 for what constitutes our eyes and our ears all over the world in these most crucial times.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I admit what the gentleman said is true, but the gentleman did not refer to five or six other divisions which I referred to, which are equally susceptible of scrutiny.

Mr. ROONEY. We have covered that in our own way. We started off with this proposition: In these highly critical



times when we need these eyes and ears all over this world in our struggle against the Communist oppressor, I do not think it behooves us to close, even partially, those eyes and those ears.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, this has to do with people here in Washington.

Mr. ROONEY. I regret that I must say that that is definitely incorrect. If the gentleman will permit me to finish my statement, I shall be glad to answer him on every point. The committee cut the amount of this appropriation to the extent of \$1,900,000 down to \$75,500,000. Now, the pending amendment would seek to cut that amount still further to the extent of \$2,500,000, although in the fiscal year 1951, which just expired June 30, the going rate called for an appropriation of \$78,492,000. The amount proposed by the committee, \$75,500,000, merely carries on our eyes and ears at the present or going rate. It does not even provide for the filling of all of the vacancies.

I want you to listen carefully to this point: This appropriation proposed by the committee is not actually an appropriation of \$75,500,000. It is an appropriation of \$65,500,000 for the reason that we have inserted in this bill language which would require the Department of State to use \$10,000,000 of the \$75,500,000 in the purchase from the Treasury of foreign currencies and credits. We have these foreign currencies and these credits as the result of sales of surplus property abroad, and they are in the United States Treasury. In order to get that \$10,000,000 in foreign currencies and credits out of the Treasury, we must appropriate in cash the amount of \$10,000,000.

It is really merely a bookkeeping transaction and the 1952 salaries and expenses of the Department of State cost the taxpayers only the amount of \$65,500,000.

The gentleman from New York mentioned a footnote at page 11, I believe he said, of the committee print. The committee was fair and aboveboard on that matter and not trying to put anything over on anybody, because in the first paragraph on page 3 of the committee report you will find this frank language:

The amount recommended represents a reduction of \$1,900,000 in the budget estimate, and is \$2,992,000 below the amount of \$78,492,000, appropriated for this item for fiscal year 1951. However, the fiscal year 1951 appropriation included certain nonrecurring items totaling \$3,823,133, the largest of which was \$3,615,000 for USIE administrative support to be financed under that appropriation in 1952.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] be voted down and that the committee's action in allowing \$75,500,000 for this important part of our Government be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 71, noes 79.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. STEFAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 126, noes 102.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we are all proud of the employees of the House and every employee connected with the organization of the House, the Parliamentarian, the reading clerks, down to these little page boys who have their lives ahead of them, and who render such important service and in whom we are all interested.

When anyone of those in the service of the House suffers a loss of any one of their near relatives, we all feel very sorry for them in that great loss and sorrow.

One of our most valued employees, starting in 1906, is our good friend Mr. A. E. Chaffee. He started in January, 1906, as an employee in the folding room. Later he became messenger in charge of the telephones; later became telephone manager for the minority; later became telephone manager for the majority, and in 1919, after going through these various steps of promotion, he was promoted to the responsible position of reading clerk of the House of Representatives. He has been one of the reading clerks since June 10, 1919.

A few days ago Mr. Chaffee lost his dear wife, his sweetheart and his companion for many years. In his sorrow we all feel very keenly for him. I know that I express the sentiments of all my colleagues when I extend to him my own personal sympathy, I also extend the sympathy of all Members of the House, in the great loss he has sustained.

These few words from Members are a source of great consolation to an employee who has lost a near and dear one, such as Mr. Chaffee has. I repeat I feel keenly for him in his bereavement, and in extending my own sympathy to him I take the liberty of extending to Mr. Chaffee and his loved ones the profound sympathy of every Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with the distinguished majority leader in paying tribute to Alney Chaffee, one of the first persons who took my hand when I came here and who steered me around in the problems which beset me at that time.

He came here originally from Otoe County, in my district in Nebraska. Always he has been cheerful and help-

ful. Certainly those of us on this side, especially in my case, from his own home district in Nebraska, join in expressing our sorrow and regret at the passing of his beloved wife.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I join with the majority leader in expression of sympathy to Mr. Chaffee. The gentleman from Massachusetts surely voices the sentiments of all of us.

I have known Mr. Chaffee for over 27 years. He has been one of our most faithful officials; a man of great energy, ability, and devoted to the public service. Always courteous and helpful to all of us, we appreciate his fine service. We all join in expressing our sympathy to him in his hour of sorrow.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the other Members of the House in expressing deepest sympathy with our friend, Mr. Chaffee, in the passing of his wife and lifetime sweetheart and companion, who for many years has been amongst us.

To me and to many others, the presence of this beautiful spirit in our midst is truly a benediction. I am quite sure that at this moment, when his own personal life seems torn apart, he does know that life is a continuing stream; that it is a wonderful adventure that has no end. I am sure he looks forward to the day when he and she will be reunited in the tide of the endless river of life ever flowing toward the great ocean of eternity. I am sure that his gentle soul has long known that—

Never the spirit was born; the spirit shall cease to be never;

Never was time it was not; end and beginning are dreams.

Birthless and deathless and changeless remaineth the spirit forever;

Death hath not touched it at all, dead though the house of it seems.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, as dean of the Nebraska delegation in Congress, I deeply appreciate the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader in reference to a man who served in this House over 40 years. When I came here 17 years ago he and William Tyler Page and others who have gone to the Great Beyond were among my friends and advisers.

On behalf of the Nebraska delegation, and I know I speak for the Members of the House, I extend deep sympathy to the family of Mr. Chaffee in this hour of their sad bereavement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely glad the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Mc-



CORMACK] has taken the floor to give his sympathy and that of the Members of the House to Mr. Chaffee in the loss of his wife. Mr. Chaffee had many talks about his wife and her devotion to him and his to her, and her helpfulness to him especially when he was ill. Mr. Chaffee is a lovable gentleman of the old school, and his wife was a gentlewoman of the same school. I think every Member here, particularly those who have served for a long time, know of Mr. Chaffee's unfailing usefulness to us. He has never played politics, and he is helpful in his courtly manner to every single Member, particularly with regard to legislation, and in every way possible I know we all mourn with this fine Christian and our great friend in his great bereavement. May God grant him courage to carry on his work and life.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, and I may add that Mr. Chaffee was helpful to every Member of the House without regard to political party.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I, too, join with my colleagues in stating that I deeply appreciate the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] making these remarks about our dear friend, Mr. Chaffee, in the loss of his helpmate for many, many years. I extend to him my deepest sympathy. I can do that sincerely, because I do not think God ever made a better man than Mr. Chaffee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the distinguished Speaker.

(By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.)

The Clerk read as follows:

#### REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131), \$850,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: "On page 4, line 22, after the comma, strike out '\$850,000' and insert in lieu thereof '\$675,000.'"

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment merely restores the amount for representation allowances to what it was a year ago, and I hope that the chairman will accept the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas to the amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained; the Stefan amendment has already been adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ACQUISITION OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

For carrying into effect the act of July 25, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 295b), including the initial alterations, repair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said act, \$8,000,000, which is exclusively for expenditure under the provisions of said act which relate to payments representing the value of foreign property or credits: *Provided*, That, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of State or such Assistant Secretary as he may designate, section 6 of the act of May 7, 1926, may be construed as including leaseholds of not less than 10 years.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word on the acquisition of buildings.

Mr. Chairman, I have been asked by numerous Members of the House on both sides of the aisle to discuss especially the acquisition of buildings abroad because of many misunderstandings.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] especially wanted me to discuss the acquisition of buildings in Bonn, Germany, the temporary capital. The Washington Evening Star carried a story to the effect that in Bonn, Germany, "they are putting the roofs on West Germany's 'Little America.' By September, a United States type community is expected to be ready on the outskirts of this German capital to house the American high commission staff."

There has been considerable criticism about that. I want the membership to know that this operation not only in Bonn, Germany, but also in Frankfurt, is not the operation of the Foreign Building Office of the Department of State for which appropriations are being made in this bill.

I have photographs and pictures of the 41 apartment houses in Frankfurt and the buildings in Bonn with me here for your inspection. These buildings are being constructed by the McCloy forces in Germany from the German economy. All of the labor, all of the furniture—I will admit that the furnishings are rather elaborate—I agree to those charges that are made—all of the architecture, all of the material and the ground are being paid for by the German economy, German marks and credits that we have against the German Government. Eventually, according to the information I have received, all of this property will go back to Germany when and if we are through with it and have no longer any use for it.

The buildings in Frankfurt are of permanent nature. Those in Bonn are temporary because it is believed that the future capital of Germany will not be in Bonn. However, I want the committee to know that we have no money in this bill for that operation.

If the committee is interested in the foreign building operations for which we make appropriations in this bill, I have photographs of buildings that we are constructing for our Foreign Service employees. In that operation I wish the committee to know that no money, no American dollars, is used in the construction of those residences for ambassadors, ministers, secretaries, and other foreign

officers because that, too, is paid for with credits and counterpart funds made available to us through UNRRA, lend-lease, surplus property, and so forth. There are no American dollars in it. This operation is the only way we can get anything back from lend-lease and surplus property. We have scattered all over the world buildings that belong to us, which are becoming more valuable every day. We will save a considerable amount. I have questioned the construction of some of the buildings that are too fancy because I fear about the maintenance costs. This committee has continuously warned the Foreign Building Office against the construction of so-called castles, the maintenance costs of which will be prohibitive, but in the long run I think this operation will save the taxpayers of the United States many, many millions of dollars.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think I understood the gentleman correctly. Is it not a fact that American dollars were first advanced through counterpart funds and that American dollars are paying for all of these buildings?

Mr. STEFAN. We gave away and junked billions of dollars of surplus material for which we got nothing, but this is one operation from which we are getting a little something back.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Sure; but our dollars are paying for every bit of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. With the possible exception of a sentence or two of his remarks, I think he has correctly described the thoughts of every Member of this subcommittee in regard to the foreign buildings operation.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to meet annual obligations to international organizations, the Government of Panama, and Gorgas Memorial Institute, pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific acts of Congress, \$29,300,000: *Provided*, That the Department of State, when requested by the United Nations, is authorized to acquire surplus property for the United Nations in accordance with existing surplus property disposal laws and regulations, and the contribution of the United States to the United Nations shall be reduced by the value of the surplus property and necessary expenses, including transportation costs, incidental to the acquisition thereof.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATTLE: On page 5, line 23, strike out "\$29,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$30,297,861."

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I am on my feet at this time for two reasons only. One is that I am chairman of the Subcommittee on International Organizations, and the second one is that this proposed cut of \$97,861 recom-



mended by the Committee on Appropriations represents a debt that we have been obligated to pay since January of this year. I am as economy-minded as anyone else, and I want to go on record as voting for economy, and if I thought this gave us an opportunity to actually save some money I would vote for it. But, actually, it represents an amount of money that we have owed since last January.

The fiscal year for the United Nations and these international organizations begins in January and not in July, as ours does, and therefore we have been participating since the first of the year as a full contributor to those organizations, and therefore we have incurred an obligation and a debt. I think it is a moral and a legal obligation that we are going to have to live up to. It is a matter of policy. If the Congress of the United States decides that we do not want to participate as a full member in the United Nations and these international organizations, that is one thing, but as long as we are in them, then it is incumbent upon us to pay our own way. I, for one, think it would be a serious and a disastrous step to get out of these organizations at a time when the United States is supposed to be the leader and at a time when world peace is in so much jeopardy.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. I feel that I must express my very grave concern over the consequences of one reduction proposed by the Appropriations Committee in the report now before us. This is the proposed reduction of \$997,861 in the appropriation contributions to international organizations. This appropriation provides for our contributions to the United Nations and to six of its specialized agencies, to the seven inter-American organizations of which the Pan American Union is the foremost, to thirteen other international organizations and to the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory and the Government of Panama. The adjusted amount proposed by the President was itself a reduction of over \$23,250,000 from the amount appropriated for this year, and it is from this greatly reduced amount that this further reduction of \$997,861 is proposed.

It is important, I think, that every Member of the House understands just what the effect of this \$997,861 reduction would be. With the exception of the amount estimated for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, all the items provided for in this appropriation represent firm international obligations of this Government. With the exception of the obligation to the Government of Panama, they all represent obligations undertaken not with just one government, but undertaken with a large number of other governments in exchange for their undertaking similar obligations to support these international organizations. The amount requested by the President, that is, \$30,297,861, represents the amount required to meet our legal obligations to

the budgets of these international organizations as developed through the constitutional processes to which we ourselves have subscribed, and to meet our legal obligation to make payment to the Government of Panama in return for our rights to the Canal Zone, and to meet the expenses of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory which are a charge against the United States alone.

The report of the House committee leaves to the discretion of the Department of State the application of this reduction of \$997,861 to the various items included in the appropriation. For myself, I do not see how this discretion can possibly be exercised in any meaningful way. With the exception of this one item for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, these items all represent firm international obligations undertaken by this Government with equal seriousness and good faith. I do not see how the Department of State could discriminate as between them. For this reason if for no other, this reduction would inevitably mean that we would be unable to meet in full our legal commitments to support the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and the organizations of the inter-American system.

However if this were not true—even if the Department of State could be expected to determine that the United States should violate its international obligation to support the South Pacific and Caribbean Commissions and the 11 other organizations not included in the United Nations or inter-American systems, and even if it should decide that the United States should default on its payment to the Government of Panama and that the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory should have no funds to operate on in 1951—the amount which would be saved by these devices would be insufficient to absorb the full reduction. It is absolutely inescapable that this reduction, if made, should not only strike at the heart of our obligation to support the international organizations of which we are a member, but should strike directly at our participation in the major organizations of the United Nations and inter-American systems.

I wonder if the House is prepared to go back on its commitments to the organizations of the United Nations system and to these organizations of our own hemisphere. It takes no great exercise of the imagination to speculate on the satisfaction with which the Soviet Union would greet the news that the United States proposed to fail to meet its obligations to support the regular budget of the United Nations. The Soviet Union and its satellites, while constantly and incessantly charging that the United Nations is little more than a tool of the United States, have continued to make their payments to its budget. Can we reconcile the leadership which we are giving to the United Nations in its political deliberations at the headquarters in New York, the leadership which we are giving the United Nations forces in the field in Korea, and the leadership which we are giving to the forces of the free world all over the

globe, with a failure to meet our legal commitment to support the regular budget of the United Nations in the amount of approximately \$16,400,000 in 1951?

With respect to the specialized agencies, the situation is different in some respects, but the reasons for our fulfilling our international commitments—not just because they are commitments, but because they are in our own very basic self-interest—are equally compelling. The Soviet Union and its satellites have not declined to join the major specialized agencies of the United Nations, or, having joined, have attempted a walk-out. Since I myself served on the United States delegation to the sixth session of the General Conference of UNESCO just concluded in Paris, I can speak with some personal familiarity as to the situation which exists there.

The Soviet Union has never been a member of UNESCO, for the very obvious reason that the free exchange of information, the raising of educational standards throughout the world and the fight against illiteracy, and the very concept of a mutual tolerance of the cultures of other nations are all anathema to it. The governments of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland did join, for what reasons I cannot say. I can say, however, that not one of these countries sent delegates to the recent conference in Paris; that Poland still owes the organization part or all of its assessments for 5 years; that Hungary owes for both 1949 and 1950, and that Czechoslovakia is in arrears for 1950. Not only was Czechoslovakia not represented at this recent meeting in Paris, but it addressed a letter to the conference condemning the organization and its work. Do we wish to associate ourselves with these satellites of the Soviet Union? I think it should also be noted that at this conference, this same organization which suffered the slander of Czechoslovakia manifested its good faith toward the United States by taking the final step of reducing the United States' contribution to 33⅓ percent of total assessments against all members, a goal which it had resolutely set for itself 3 years ago when the United States contribution stood at 41.88 percent.

In the case of the World Health Organization, the Soviet Union and its satellites, once members, have one after the other announced that they no longer consider themselves members and, in the case of the Soviet Union, have withheld financial support from the very outset. The WHO has refused to recognize these declarations of withdrawal, just as it has refused to recognize the declaration of withdrawal on the part of Nationalist China, and has continued to make annual assessments against these members although the nonpayment of contributions by these countries has been a matter of serious financial concern to the other members. These other members of WHO, like those of UNESCO, this year reduced the United States percentage of contribution the final step to 33⅓ percent of total assessments from the figure



of 38.54 percent where it stood 3 years ago. Do we wish to associate the United States, in WHO, with the cynical actions taken by the Soviet Union and satellite states in defaulting on their obligations?

Again, in the case of the Food and Agriculture Organization, the Soviet Union has never deigned to accept the responsibilities of membership, and those satellites who did become members, namely, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, have announced their withdrawal from the organization. Of the total assessments against the membership of FAO, the United States is assessed 27.10 percent. I am confident that this House does not wish to associate itself in any manner with these satellite members of FAO.

As a result of my period of service on the United States delegation to this recent meeting of UNESCO, one fact was brought very forcefully to bear upon my attention. That is that the actions of the United States in these organizations are brought under the very direct scrutiny of the peoples of the free world whom we are trying so strenuously to win to our side, and to keep on our side, in our struggle with Soviet Communist imperialism. We are not dealing with other countries through conventional diplomatic channels when we meet them in the councils of these international organizations. Rather, we are dealing directly with the leaders of the various important sections of the national life of each other country—leaders who have a very strong influence on the manner in which the peoples of these other countries view the United States and its efforts for world peace.

In the case of UNESCO, we are dealing collectively, at one time and at one place, with the ministers of education of the member nations and their personal representatives. We are dealing also with the presidents of universities and other representatives of the people of each country who are leaders in the fields of education, informational exchange, and cultural activities; and who strongly influenced the development of their peoples either toward the United States or away from us.

In the case of the World Health Organization, we are dealing directly with the ministers of health of the other member states and with their leading men of medicine, with men in particular who are trying to wipe out disease from the economically underdeveloped countries and who are very much interested in knowing whether or not the United States is responsive to their needs.

In the case of the Food and Agriculture Organization, we are dealing directly with the leaders of agriculture of the nations of the free world, and with their principal representatives; with men who want to know whether the agricultural policy of the United States is going to take into account the needs of their own peoples for food and for a fair return from their agricultural products.

These people have had their answer from the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has told them, by acts speaking louder than words, that it is not pre-

pared to meet with them on an equal basis in the conferences of these specialized agencies; that it is not disposed to encourage the mutual exchange of views or the free flow of information; that it is not possible for it to lend its assistance to projects of economic assistance in the field of agriculture, health, and so forth, which are determined jointly by some 60 nations. These people have been confident that they also had our answer, an answer to the effect that we were prepared to do all these things for the benefit of all which the Soviet Union is not prepared to do. Action by the Congress in denying the full amount of money required to meet our assessments for the budgets of these organizations would shake this confidence, and would immediately communicate to the peoples of the free world they represent the conclusion that the United States is embarking upon a program of withdrawing its support from the democratically constituted organizations of the United Nations system.

The observations which I have made with respect to the organizations of the United Nations system apply equally with respect to those organizations of our own hemisphere, that is, to the Organization of American States with its central secretariat, the Pan American Union; to the Pan American Sanitary Organization; and to the other organizations of that system. With long and hard work over the years we have gradually substituted in this hemisphere the concept of collective action and self-aid for the concept of either indifference to or total reliance upon this one nation, the United States. To deny financial support in adequate measure to the organizations of the inter-American system would undermine this work at a very critical time.

I hope I am not misguided in my confidence that the Congress will stand by the commitments of this Government to support these international organizations which are so important to our relations with other governments of the free world, and that the full amount required will be appropriated.

Mr. BATTLE. I thank the gentleman. Because we disagree with some of these programs that are in process of being carried out—and I disagree with some of them—it does not give us a license to renege on our obligations. Actually, we should study them, correct them, and help to improve them. But the main point is that we should make our policies for the future and not try to make them retroactive by cutting off funds.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. As I understand, the sum that the gentleman from Alabama seeks to restore is the amount that was authorized under the basic legislation adopted by the Congress, and that is all.

Mr. BATTLE. That is right.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If the committee recommendation is accepted, we would not only be subtracting a sum from that authorized by basic legisla-

tion, but also withholding a sum that the Government has legally committed us to in the United Nations budget; is that not correct?

Mr. BATTLE. That is correct. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

I believe it is necessary for us to remain economy minded for the sake of saving and efficiency, but I do not believe any of us want to put the United States in the position of refusing to pay a legitimate debt that we have incurred.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. As a member of the committee that has brought this measure before the House, I commend the gentleman on justifying the authorization we made. This is one of the problems that confronts the Committee on Appropriations when we are attempting to go over appropriation bills. We find that we are morally responsible for amounts which have been previously approved by the Congress. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman for taking the stand that he has.

Mr. BATTLE. I thank the gentleman. I think we are legally and morally bound to pay this debt.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia to the amendment offered by Mr. BATTLE: Strike out "\$30,297,869" and insert "\$27,000,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives and the Nation are due a vote of thanks to the subcommittee which handled this bill and to its able chairman. I have read a great part of the hearings. I have noted in many instances the forthright manner in which the able chairman has thrust aside camouflage and subterfuges and brought out the facts.

I believe this particular item in the bill should be reduced further, from \$29,300,000 to \$27,000,000. The committee in past years has sought to reduce the percentage of United States participation in contributions to international organizations. To that end it has brought pressure to bear upon the State Department, but the results have been most disappointing. Indeed, the committee records its disappointment on page 5 of the report submitted on this bill.

Last year the International Refugee Organization was in this item and was provided with \$25,000,000. However, this item is no longer in the budget;



when this fact is considered it will be noted that the committee allowance is about \$1,500,000 above last year.

The theory of computing these contributions on the basis of alleged ability to pay is extremely questionable. On page 651 of the hearings the witness, Mr. Hall, said that one of the factors considered in fixing the contribution is that we have the highest national income per capita of any country in the world.

We also have the largest deficit. We also have the largest per capita national debt.

We are allowed only one vote in these various organizations and it is a doubtful privilege we have of putting up most of the operating money.

I regard it as unfair that our taxpayers here were assessed 38.47 percent of the total assessment for support of the United Nations educational, scientific, and cultural organizations for the calendar year 1949, as compared with approximately 13 percent assessed against the United Kingdom, and approximately 7 percent assessed against France; further that we were assessed 37.82 percent of total assessments for the calendar year 1950, as compared with these far smaller assessments to these other countries. These percentages, and amounts are set forth in the hearings on pages 287, 295, 603. Various testimony is scattered throughout the hearings on the subject. However, that is not the final word. Some of these countries against whom assessments are made do not pay them as assessed, and the tables show that in fact our payments to the United Nations educational, scientific, and cultural organizations were in the calendar year 1949 actually 42.62 percent of the total amount paid, and in the calendar year 1950 were actually 42.77 percent of the assessments actually paid for operation of this UNESCO organization.

Also, it is well for us to have an understanding of what this UNESCO organization actually does. On page 621 of the hearings, where it is of course set forth in its best light by the witness, I notice among the projects to which it devotes itself is one of "encouraging textbook improvement, particularly in history and geography, through the development of aids for preparation of modern textbooks; provision of direct assistance to member states in improvement of their own textbooks and in evaluating foreign textbooks; and fostering of bilateral and multilateral arrangements for textbook study and improvement."

I note they say in that paragraph:

Already as a result of UNESCO's efforts 10 of the leading textbook distributors of Belgium have agreed to the idea of revising or improving their history books in line with UNESCO suggestions, with more emphasis being placed on cultural and social questions and the work of international agencies.

I am opposed to giving money to this organization to meddle in textbooks anywhere in the world. Particularly, I do not want this organization meddling with history books and geography books in this country. We already have enough trouble with left-wing, crackpot, radical organizations and individuals

getting insidious propaganda into our school textbooks.

This organization is in bad odor and repute in other respects. In the Washington Star of July 15 an article was published regarding it by Marcel Wallenstein in Paris. In that article Wallenstein said:

Men and women who have the softest jobs in the world at good pay, and tax-free, are beginning to worry. A fire has been lit under the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which has been meeting here in plenary session.

The British, who pay one-eighth of UNESCO's expenses and the French, who pay less, are beginning to grumble. The United States taxpayer, who pays twice as much as anybody else for what one European editor has called the crackpot's carnival, seems not to be worried about the drain on his small change.

Also, in connection with this amendment I would like to quote the following from a recent report of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, dealing with this subject matter:

The United Nations and its specialized agencies have now been functioning approximately 5 years and no appreciable stabilization is apparent as yet. On the contrary, the subcommittee found that there has been a continuous increase in growth and activities which is clearly reflected in steadily increasing budgets and expenditures, projects undertaken, personnel employed, conferences and meetings and documentation. In addition, only slight progress appears to have been made with respect to the correction of basic structural weaknesses and deficiencies, duplication and overlapping, proliferation of bodies and commissions. Finally, the subcommittee found that increasing expenditures and activities have become a serious drain and burden upon the financial and manpower resources of many of the member governments of these organizations and may ultimately impair the effective operation of the entire system.

Also:

United States contributions and outlays to the United Nations, its specialized agencies, emergency-relief projects, and advances on the United Nations building loan have totaled approximately \$424,000,000 from fiscal year 1946 through and including fiscal year 1950, and present indications are that these activities will entail additional contributions and outlays in excess of \$120,000,000 during fiscal year 1951; and United States outlays and contributions to the United Nations system and emergency-relief projects averaged approximately 50 percent of the total budgets and expenditures of these organizations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia to the record of yesterday's proceedings here in the House wherein there is a full and complete answer on behalf of the Department of State with regard to each and every allegation of Marcel Wallenstein who, I understand, was not at the recent UNESCO Conference in Paris which was attended by a member of this committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I know the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] was there.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

(Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. It was my experience and good fortune in 1949 to accompany a select committee of the Expenditures Committee to Europe and the Near East. One of our chief objects was to make a study of international organizations. Of course, we were unable to give thorough consideration to the activities of all the international organizations so we centered our studies upon three or four of them which were typical, such as the World Health Organization, United Nations International Children's Welfare Fund and the Food and Agricultural Organization, and finally the organization having to do with Palestine relief. It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that in a sense we are contributing inequitably to these organizations and that we should restrict our commitments in this field and insist that the other nations come through with their appropriate shares. I feel that that would be good not only from the standpoint of our own people but also that it would be a very important factor from the standpoint of building our prestige among other nations. I have the feeling that many of the other nations operate upon the theory that, "If we do not pay the bill, Uncle Sam will." If they are truly a part of the United Nations, it is a part of their real responsibility.

I want to agree wholeheartedly in the recommendations of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], and I hope that we will sustain them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was going to call to the attention of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] the fact that the committee he refers to, and of which he was a member at that time, also carried on a very thorough investigation of the UNESCO Conference in Paris, and, if my memory serves me correctly, issued a favorable report.

I would also like to say that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], who was a congressional delegate to the last conference, was primarily responsible for seeing to it that the budgetary appropriation for the United States to the UNESCO Conference was reduced considerably. He did a magnificent job representing the Congress in that conference.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.



I happen to be a member of a subcommittee with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] on international organizations, and that is why I am speaking on this subject.

Of course, I support the Battle amendment, and I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I prefer not to. I have only a short time.

There are two things I would like to impress upon the membership today. One is that we criticize Soviet Russia for not fulfilling her commitments. We have made certain commitments on a formula, which has been agreed upon, on ability to pay, of these different nations. It is true some of the nations have not met their obligations, but does that excuse us from meeting ours? That is point No. 1.

The World Health Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the International Labor Office, UNESCO, the International Health Communications Union, the Organization of American States, and related bodies are all involved in this. About half of this cut of \$900,000 is in the World Health Organization. Certainly, it is an important objective to obtain agreements in regard to all types of health preservation and disease prevention, especially in these days when we are traveling from nation to nation, and the likelihood of carrying disease is so great. It is certainly to our interest to spend a half million dollars to see that this sort of thing is carried on. I ask that the Davis amendment be voted down and that the Battle amendment be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to close debate.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose both the Battle and Davis amendments. I have always contended that it is just not good sense to attempt to write appropriation bills here on the floor of the House, after appropriations committees have studied the problems contained therein for months, 5 days a week, each day from 10 o'clock in the morning until 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE], which would insert an additional \$997,861 in the bill, for the reason that as of June 30 just past, the end of fiscal year 1951, there was returned to the Treasury from contributions to international organizations the amount of \$1,836,921, as a result of reductions in amounts required for the United States' share of contributions to international organizations. It was on the basis of that that your committee made a reduction in the budget request down to the amount inserted in the bills to wit, \$29,300,000.

I oppose the meat-ax cut suggested by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] for the reason that during the past year our representatives to these

international organizations have steadily changed, by way of reduction generally, the amount of our contributions. I am speaking of changes in regard to about 15 of these international organizations in which the United States has membership. I will give you an instance of what has happened since June 30, 1951, with regard to our share of the cost of our membership in UNESCO.

At the recent meeting of UNESCO, I believe, about the 11th of July, the instant month, in Paris, which was attended by the distinguished and able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], the figures shown on page 5 of the committee report, which pointed out a decrease in the amount of our contributions to UNESCO from 37.82 percent to 35 percent, was further reduced to 33½ percent. Are we going to hamstring our American representatives? Are we going to embarrass the people who represent us in the United Nations and other international organizations? Are we going to hamstring a man of the fine type of Warren Austin, a member of your own party, who represents us in the United Nations? At such a critical time as this, should we not do everything we possibly can to keep our chins up in front of all the other nations of the world and meet our obligations? Will this proposed action not adversely affect our efforts to get further help from the UN nations for a victory in Korea?

I might say that the amount proposed by the committee in this bill does not suggest in any way a reluctance to meet the shares which we are required to meet when arrived at by agreement between the member nations which comprise these various international organizations. What we do and have for some time done is insist that our representatives make every effort to reduce every American share. We are making headway.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. I would like to say this to the members of the committee: I was very much impressed as I attended this conference in Paris by the genuine effort on the part of our delegation to bring about a reduction in our contribution to this organization. The same also held true in regard to WHO at Geneva this year.

If you adopt the Davis amendment, you will, in effect, put us a million and a half dollars in arrears with the United Nations, in addition to many thousands of dollars with the specialized agencies. Are you going to have the United States Government renege on its treaty obligations? If so, then adopt the Davis amendment. It is exactly the same as though you had a note at the bank and plenty of money in your account and then willfully defaulted on paying the note. That is not the way we do business in this country. We owe the money.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I decline to yield in this very brief time that has been allotted to me.

If you want to violate the legal obligation of our Government, then adopt the Davis amendment and you will succeed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there was \$1,800,000 left in the Treasury last year?

Mr. ROONEY. As of June 30, that is correct—\$1,836,921.

Mr. TABER. If you subtract \$1,800,000 from \$30,684,000, you get \$28,800,000. The committee on the basis of what was left over has not cut enough if my arithmetic is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Let me agree with the gentleman when he says that this is a matter of arithmetic. It concerns many, many items, every single one of which was taken into consideration by the committee in arriving at the figure they suggest to the House of Representatives, to wit: \$29,300,000.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that both the Davis amendment and the Battle amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired, all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 83, noes 74.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 92.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 87, noes 85.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and Mr. ROONEY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 127, noes 102.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

[Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Page 6, line 6, after the period add a new proviso to read: "Provided further, That in no case shall the United States con-



tribution to any international organization exceed one-third of the estimated total annual cost."

[Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to insist upon the point of order that this is legislation on an appropriation bill. We already have basic legislation setting a ceiling on these contributions to international organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to say except that I insist it is a limitation of appropriations. The amendment speaks for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment certainly goes far beyond being a limitation.

The gentleman from Mississippi has offered an amendment; the gentleman from New York has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair invites attention to the fact that the amendment provides for changes in existing law with respect to international organizations and, of course, is legislation and not in order on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

(Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made earlier today.)

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend remarks he made at various times during the consideration of the bill in the Committee of the Whole.)

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word only because I feel it is necessary for me to respond to some statements made by the gentleman from Mississippi. I do not profess to be an international lawyer of repute, but I think I can answer his simple question.

We received congressional authority to join the United Nations, and we joined them; we all know, as a matter of fact, that we were the principal movers in organizing the United Nations. As the specialized agencies were set up under the United Nations we likewise received authority to join these organizations. When we joined we agreed to be bound by the vote of the majority under the rule adopted by those specialized agencies; consequently, when they were organized the formula for paying the contribution by the various member states was adopted by the particular conference in question, whether it was WHO, ILO, or UNESCO. Therefore we became legally bound to do one of two things: We either stayed in and paid up or we got out and quit it. It is just like joining the Masons, Odd Fellows, or any other organization: Either you pay your dues or get out. If they say your dues will be \$10 a year and you think it should be \$5 you either pay the \$10 or get out. That is the position we are in today.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is entirely in error when he says that we agreed to pay what the majority voted or that we are legally bound. That question comes up time and again, and in the legislation which has been discussed it did not fix a floor for a specific amount but it did fix ceilings. The fact is that these are merely moral commitments and have no legal status until the Congress acts on them.

Mr. PRESTON. I take no stock in the assertion just made by the gentleman from Ohio. If we join any international organization and become participants bound by its rules and regulations adopted and they by a majority fix the amount of money that the member states shall pay on a formula, then, of course, you are bound to pay it or else get out. How else can you stay in?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, basing my assumption on the gentleman's line of reasoning, if these organizations should say that the United States shall pay 100 percent, then the gentleman would say we are legally bound to pay that 100 percent?

Mr. PRESTON. No; I would say we would get out, quit. We certainly would not pay it.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Who formulates these UNESCO programs? I think they are entirely too broad. How can we hold down these programs to a sensible cost, to a sensible proposition?

Mr. PRESTON. I went to UNESCO headquarters, and talked to the people. I looked into the type of program they were operating, and I found no such situation existing in that particular organization, despite this man Wallenstine who copied an article written by a British correspondent. This man Wallenstine did not get into the shadow of the building over there and knows nothing about what is going on. There is a great deal of misinformation abroad about the type of programs that are being conducted. I do not subscribe to everything that UNESCO, ILO and these other organizations do, but they are doing a sensible job of promotion among the various national commissions. They are not operating a program themselves except in very minor instances. They are doing a good promotional job, and that is the sort of thing we have to have throughout all of the nations of the world.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mention one specific program that has helped us directly.

Mr. PRESTON. One program is in connection with UNESCO, which is to carry fundamental education into countries where illiteracy runs rampant, where people cannot read or write. They are promoting fundamental education in those areas in a manner that is satisfactory to me.

Mr. JOHNSON. How does that help us in America?

Mr. PRESTON. We are not doing these things from the standpoint of how it is helping us in America. We are helping the undeveloped countries of the world. It is not a pork-barrel organization. We do not go into them to begin with to see what we as Americans will get out of it.

What is all this talk about arbitrarily fixing the United States contributions to international organizations at 33⅓ percent? Have not the gentlemen who are sounding off on this matter as though they were originating some bold new economy ever taken the trouble to acquaint themselves with the facts concerning these contributions? Do not they understand that the contributions to many of the international organizations will be greatly less than 33⅓ percent—or do they want to raise some of the contributions under the cloak of a righteous appeal for economy? Do not they know that our contribution to 17 of the 28 organizations we are considering here is already less than 33⅓ percent? The over-all average for 1952 is 37.21 percent and some reductions have already been made for next year. Cannot they understand that these reductions constitute hard-won negotiations with other UN contributors at a time we are putting the pressure on our UN colleagues to provide more soldiers to help our boys in Korea?

If we are to talk about percentage contributions intelligently, we must predicate our discussion on the facts—not make a high-sounding appeal which defies the facts. Here are the facts:

Thirty million, two hundred ninety-seven thousand, eight hundred and sixty-one dollars is the amount required for the United States to meet its obligations to these international organizations in fiscal year 1952. This is a reduction of over \$23,250,000 or 43½ percent under the amount appropriated for this year. As I said before, the percentage contribution to 17 out of 28 international organizations is less than 33⅓, and this number will be greater next year.

I know for a fact that our representatives in the UN and specialized agencies have exerted every effort to secure a reduction to 33⅓ percent to those organizations where it is now higher than that figure. Those efforts have been successful, and our contribution will be at or below that figure in all of the organizations of the UN system, with the exception of the UN itself. Specifically, while the United States will contribute at a percentage of 35 percent to the 1951 budgets of UNESCO and WHO, to which this present appropriation request relates, our contribution to the budgets of these two organizations for the calendar year 1952 will be at 33⅓ percent. In the case of WHO, this represents a reduction over 3 years from a percentage of 38.54 percent, and in the case of UNESCO a reduction over 3 years from a percentage of 41.88 percent. Again I say, these reductions constitute hard-won negotiations with other UN contributors at a time when we are putting the



pressure on our UN colleagues to provide more soldiers to help our boys in Korea.

In the case of the UN itself, while the goal of 33½ percent which was to be achieved as economic conditions improved and the admission of new members permitted has not been reached, the United States percentage has been reduced from 39.89 percent to 34.92 percent. In the case of all other specialized agencies to which the United States contributes annually, the United States contribution stands at a figure considerably below 33½ percent.

While 33½ percent is a reasonable figure for the United States contribution in the case of the UN and the other organizations with a world-wide membership in the neighborhood of some 60 nations, I think we should all be aware that this figure represents a contribution considerably below what we ourselves have confessed to be our capacity to pay. Likewise, such a percentage of contribution for the United States is neither reasonable nor fair in the case of the inter-American organizations. Here we are 1 of 21 members at the most, and these members include among them some of the smallest and most poverty-ridden nations of the world. They are also the nations—mark this—no thinking man can fail to regard as absolutely essential to our national security and welfare. By any criteria of the so-called capacity to pay which any of us might develop, the United States capacity would stand in relationship to that of these other countries at a figure somewhere between 90 percent and 99 percent. Despite this, the representatives of the United States Government have constantly pressed for a reduction in our percentage where it was particularly high, that is, in the Pan American Union and in the Pan American Sanitary Organization. Two years ago, when our percentage stood at 72 percent, they secured agreement that the United States percentage would be reduced gradually to 66 percent, and the reductions necessary to achieve that goal are now being made every year. The amount of money involved in our contributions to these organizations of the inter-American system is a little over \$3,200,000.

Now with reference to the Marcel Wallenstein article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star, under a Paris date line of July 14, was largely derived from an earlier article appearing in the London Sunday Express of July 1, under the byline of John Gordon. The leader of the British delegation to the Sixth General Conference of UNESCO in Paris, the Honorable David R. Hardman, Member of Parliament and Parliamentary Under Secretary of the Ministry of Education, issued a statement at that time refuting the allegations made by John Gordon and challenging the editor of the Sunday Express to open its columns so that the public can be given the truth about the organization he so lightheartedly libels. Below is a copy of the statement Mr. Hardman gave to the press in Paris immediately following the publication of the article in the Sunday Express. As of July 20,

the Sunday Express had not published Mr. Hardman's statement:

DAVID HARDMAN REPLY TO SUNDAY EXPRESS ARTICLE

"Four falsehoods in a five-line paragraph is a pretty fair achievement. And this is the record set up in the latest attack on UNESCO, published in the Sunday Express.

"In one single paragraph, the Sunday Express declared that: The Director General's assistant gets 4,464 pounds a year plus 4,160 pounds expenses. His personal assistant 2,836 pounds. His stenographers 17 pounds a week. His lowest paid messengers 11 pounds a week.

"In fact the Director General's personal assistant who is also his secretary, gets not 2,836 pounds but 1,400 pounds a year, and members of the secretarial pool in his office not 3,268 pounds but 868 pounds a year each.

"UNESCO stenographers, who are stated to get 17 pounds a week, in fact start at 9 pounds, unless they can work in the two languages, when they begin at 11 pounds, 10 shillings. The lowest paid messengers get, not 11 pounds a week but 6 pounds a week.

"You can go on like that right through the article. It states that UNESCO secretaries get cigarettes and spirits duty free—not true; that UNESCO has proposed an inquiry into illiteracy in British colonies—untrue; that it has set up a committee to consider the problem of a small African tribe who could not pronounce the words of their language unless their front teeth had been knocked out when they were small—balderdash."

Referring to the article as "the annual anti-UNESCO Beaverbrook blether," Mr. Hardman said:

"Flogging UNESCO with lies, distortions and inaccuracies is an easy game for Philistines, for it calls for very little cerebral activity.

"I make the article's final score 11 falsehoods, five misrepresentations and one distortion.

"I challenge the editor of the Sunday Express to open its columns so that the public can be given the truth about the organization he so lightheartedly libels."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to support the argument of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON]. I think he probably explained our participation in this but for fear someone did not understand, may I say that in the first place this Congress adopted the United Nations philosophy. In other words, we joined the United Nations and we have been trying to make the United Nations a success.

Outside of the formal organization of the United Nations, there are quite a number of auxiliary organizations which are in harmony with the United Nations Charter. They operate in a certain field, like the World Health Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, the International Communications Union and so forth. These are all auxiliary organizations that are formed for the purpose of world harmony along the lines they are working on. They all have a very distinct good to the United States, in my opinion, as well as to these other countries.

We must have international agreements on all of these different subjects if we are going to be efficient as far as

our own actions along these particular lines are concerned. As we took the leadership in the United Nations, we also took the leadership in forming a great many of these auxiliary organizations. However, it was necessary, of course, to have a budget prepared and when we came together with the different nations participating in these auxiliary organizations, and there are about 20 I believe, the representatives of the different nations agreed upon a budget.

This formula was set up based upon ability to pay, which everyone thought was fair. We get a certain assessment. We get an assessment on our ability to pay in comparison with some of the other nations that are participating. It is true that we do pay more than some of the nations that are practically bankrupt, such as the Marshall nations, like France, England and others that we are trying to help back on their feet. We do pay proportionately more than they do. If anyone fails to pay these amounts, it does make ours go up in proportion, from say 33 percent to 39 percent, whatever it is, that is lagging in the other nations. But once having agreed on that formula, and once having decided that the program itself was worth while not only to our own Nation, but to strengthen the whole fabric of the United Nations, we do have a moral obligation. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY] said, it is only a moral obligation. Well, what stronger obligation can there be than a moral obligation in the eyes of the world? We are trying to obtain leadership in the world and are trying to exert that leadership, and the fact that the Soviet Union has pulled out of the picture is giving us an advantage in trying to sell that collective security, and this is part of collective security, just the same as the Atlantic Pact is for collective security. So, that it is really a moral obligation on our part to contribute our part of the expenses necessary to sustain these various activities.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman says we are morally obligated to pay. Would he say we were morally obligated to pay if we agreed to assess the United States 90 or 95 percent of it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do, if we would agree to it. But, I do not think we would agree to it. When they set up the Budget, our representatives are there, and they agree upon what they consider to be a fair Budget, and once they agree to that fair Budget, then I think we are morally committed. I do not believe that our people would go into it and agree that we should pay 100 percent. In fact, they have refused to. As a matter of fact, you take the World Health Organization, that has been reduced from about 42 percent to 33 percent in the last 2 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman think to limit it to 33 percent, which would still be the largest contribution of any country to these organizations, would be to go back on our commitments?



Mr. HOLIFIELD. If we agree to 34 percent and limit it to 33 percent, it certainly would be, because that is a retroactive cut. If you would say we should agree to 33 percent in the future, that is a different proposition, but we are already obligated, and this is an obligation to which we are morally committed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. When did we obligate ourselves to pay 35, 40 or 45 percent of the expenses of any of these organizations?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is using his own percentages. But, I say the obligations that do exist are the result of conferences held in the last 12 months, and some of them go back, I understand, 18 months because, as I understand, we are about 6 months behind in getting our particular commitments into the international organizations.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the discussions we have just been listening to are very interesting, particularly to those of us from California. It was host when the initial conference was held on the formulation of the United Nations. Those of us who then were interested in Government were also interested in what that charter provided. Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., in his carrying letter to the President of the United States, knew that we were interested; he knew that the people of our country were interested; he knew that this Congress was interested, both the Senate and the House; he knew that when he wrote his carrying letter in which he said, in effect—and I ask you to read the letter to find his interpretation—that we have set up a new legislature, based upon the traditions of free people, but it has no power to make laws. Yes; he went on and said that we have set up a great new court, the result of tradition and free government, but it has no power, no jurisdiction. The parties must agree to come before the court and when the court renders its decision, the parties must agree to abide by that decision. No bailiff can enforce the order of the court; no army can enforce it. Yes; we have set up a new system, a new agency of government without power to tax, without power to make law, without power to enforce law. That is the United Nations. After he said that they had set up this debating society this Congress agreed to it because there was no delegation of sovereignty.

In California the United Nations is now writing the alien land law. In the Southern States it is alleged that they can write a segregation law, and now the gentlemen on that side of the aisle today are telling us that this new agency of international government can usurp the power of this Congress, and this House, to control appropriation bills. What ridiculous language are we listening to? If a majority of the Members of this House think for one instant that there is any legal, binding act by which these representatives of ours in the United Nations can bind us, then the first order of business is to reconsider why we are in the United Nations and how much longer we should stay in. If there is any Mem-

ber of this House who believes that any person entering into a contract, whether he be a person or a nation, knowing the limitations of other contracting parties in regard to appropriations and binding agreements, can claim that he has any moral or legal right, by reason of dealing with such person, then it is time that we reconsider why we are in the United Nations and how much longer we should stay in.

So far as I am concerned, under the Constitution of the United States. I think the State of California writes its alien land law. I think this House and the Senate have no power to enter into any kind of agreement or treaty that gives that power to a majority of foreigners.

(Mr. WERDEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] made an amazing statement a little bit ago, contrary to everything, as the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] has just said, that has ever been presented to the Congress or the American people about our participation in these international organizations. I think it might be of interest to read from the unanimous committee report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of August 11, 1949, when the bill providing for ceilings on membership participation by the United States in certain international organizations was recommended by the committee. The bill was House Joint Resolution 334, which passed and is now the law. I want to read the unanimous report of the committee which states the legal and constitutional principles applying to our membership in international organizations that have never been questioned, so far as I know, until today in this debate:

The American people have by their Constitution vested the authority over appropriations in their Congress. This authority has not been yielded or transcended under any act of participation in an international organization. The Congress cannot convey elsewhere its ultimate obligations in this matter. It is a principle inherent in our Constitution. It is just as well that this be understood explicitly by the other governments joining with this Government in international organizations.

I voted with the Appropriations Committee on this matter a few moments ago because I thought they had struck a fair balance in what they had brought to the floor for these organizations and that the Davis amendment cut too deep, but in my vote I did not consider for one moment the argument that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] presented, which was that, having joined some international organization where our constitutional rights were reserved, we had entered into an agreement which was binding upon us, and that if Congress did not go through with an agreement made by our delegates, we would be breaking a legal obligation of the United States.

This is what happened at one time on UNRRA. Will Clayton was our delegate

to a meeting of UNRRA. He got up and moved that the contribution of each country be made 1 percent of its national income. That was adopted by the collection committee of UNRRA. He then came back and attempted to say to our Foreign Affairs Committee that we now had some legal or moral obligation to carry out what had been enacted on the basis of his motion. Our committee made short shrift of this legal argument. We had to consider that in our position of world leadership it is important that we have working relationships between those who purport to represent our country in these organizations and the appropriate committees of the Congress, but we have always kept clearly in mind the difference between political commitments by the Executive and moral obligations that are binding on our Government. We also remember that no one can legally bind Congress in advance to vote funds in such agreements. There are a few instances in which specific amounts of contributions have already been agreed to by law, by act of Congress. But when Congress did that they were exercising their constitutional authority. Nobody was exercising it for them at some far away meeting. One embarrassment has been that other countries sometimes will not accept through their constitutional procedures the amounts that have been agreed to by Congress and it therefore costs us more proportionately than we intended, as has been brought out this afternoon in debate. However, as long as each country reserves, as we do, the right to review the agreements their delegates make, this may happen.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It has been repeatedly said on the floor of the House and very properly so that one Congress cannot bind the next Congress. Yet there seems to be growing sentiment among Members of the House that in foreign affairs at least the appointed representatives to these various international organizations can bind the Congress for generations to come. In my opinion that is a surrender of our constitutional legislative powers.

Mr. VORYS. That would be a surrender of our constitutional duty. I did not know there was any such growing sentiment. I never in my life heard before this afternoon a proposition brought to the floor that entrance into one of these organizations, reserving our full constitutional rights, constituted a binding legal agreement which would bind the hands of the Congress and force us to vote specific amounts of money.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending paragraph close in 6 minutes, the time to include the time of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].



The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, you have really struck upon the greatest issue before the American people today: The question of whether you are going to keep intact our constitutional government as we have known it since 1787 or whether you are going to surrender some of that sovereign power to some world organization of which you will be a part. You do not have to guess what is going to happen. It has already happened. The Charter of the United Nations was presented to the Senate of the United States and approved by it. In that Charter it says that men shall have the right to own property. In the State of California there is a law against foreigners owning property. When a case involving that question came into court they cited the Constitution of the United States, which says that treaties, when approved by the Senate of the United States, shall become the supreme law of the land.

The next thing that will come before the Senate of the United States is the charter of human rights. Let me tell you what that is. I am not so sure but what it will be approved. The other one was. Most of it was prepared by Hiss, but it was approved by the Senate just the same, with two dissenting votes. The Member from North Dakota, Senator WILLIAM LANGER, was one of the Senators who voted "no."

This charter of human rights provides that if I make a statement that injures the feelings of any group—you do not have to shoot at them—but if I injure the feelings of any group, I am guilty and will be tried. Where, as an American citizen? I will not be tried in North Dakota where I reside. I will be tried where the United Nations says I shall be tried. It is possible to take an American citizen to Czechoslovakia and try him for any statement he might make in a speech, and your free speech and your free press, as we have known it in this country, is gone.

Now, I think it is time to be on the alert for all of these different schemes to destroy this Nation.

A new system of education is being tried out in California. California seems to be a State where you can try anything once. This new system of education is to say that the child exists for the State. We have always understood that the State existed for the individual. They are having trouble out there over that situation. A lot of college professors of this Nation have O. K.'d this new plan. They say that parents have no control over his education after the child enters school; that they will take care of him from then on and fit him for a group; not for a dignified citizen of this country, but a member of a group. Now, that is what they are trying to do, but California says "No."

Why do you not enforce the narcotics law in this country? You are not doing it. You are not doing it because the men who are engaged in the enforcement of that law are spending their time in the

United Nations to find out if we cannot build a better organization to enforce the laws of this country. Every one of these movements is designed to take away the sovereign power of the United States.

The only control you have over it, the only control, is through appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES

For necessary expenses of participation by the United States upon approval by the Secretary of State, in international activities which arise from time to time in the conduct of foreign affairs and for which specific appropriations have not been provided pursuant to treaties, conventions, or special acts of Congress, including personal services without regard to civil-service and classification laws; salaries, expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); employment of aliens; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and without regard to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949; not to exceed \$15 per diem in lieu of subsistence for persons serving without compensation in an advisory capacity while away from their homes or regular places of business; rent of quarters by contract or otherwise; hire of passenger motor vehicles; contributions for the share of the United States in expenses of international organizations; and printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); \$2,700,000, of which not to exceed a total of \$100,000 may be expended for representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the act of August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131) and for entertainment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 8, line 1, after the semicolon, strike out "\$2,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,600,000."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because this was a sort of educated guess on the part of the committee when they made minor cuts. My further investigation indicates they have \$950,000 on hand, unspent and unobligated. I, too, want to join others in the feeling that just because we have a large national income does not mean that we can join other nations in allowing them to set our percentage of expenditures in international conferences and meetings.

I have in my hand a list of approximately two or three hundred such conferences that are considered. It is taking a tremendous amount of will power on the part of employees of the State Department to turn down some of the requests for these meetings. I think that only by holding down appropriations can we uphold the hands of those in the Department of State when they are lobbied and pressed to call meetings which are unnecessary and of which we pay a tremendous part of the expense.

I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses, regular boundary activities, including examinations, preliminary surveys, and investigations, \$900,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, recently I charged the Department of State with matters contained in a column written by Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 30, 1951, and demanded a reply thereto. I now include the following letter addressed to me under date June 23, 1951, by Deputy Under Secretary of State Carlisle H. Humelsine as well as the enclosures mentioned therein:

JULY 23, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY,  
*House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. ROONEY: At your request I am sending you herewith our comments on a column written by Fulton Lewis, Jr., and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 30, 1951, page 7690. This column concerned various allegations made by a former employee of the office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany. In a nutshell, this employee is alleged to have told Mr. Lewis that his job in Germany was a complete farce, that he was supplied with servants, an automobile, a chauffeur, a telephone, high salary, etc., but that all he did on the job was to drink, hunt, and, in general, have a good time at the taxpayers' expense.

The enclosed is our answer to this utterly fantastic story. I am also enclosing a letter from the United States High Commissioner for Germany, John J. McCloy, to the Secretary on the same matter.

Sincerely yours,

CARLISLE H. HUMELSINE.

COMMENTS ON LETTER ADDRESSED TO FULTON LEWIS, JR. INSERTED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF JUNE 30, 1951, PAGE 7690.

The column written by Fulton Lewis, Jr., published a letter from a former employee of the Office of the United States High Commissioner for Germany in which the former employee made various allegations concerning his employment and living conditions. The following breakdown of his allegations and answers prepared on the basis of information furnished by the Office of the United States High Commissioner is submitted for your information.

Allegation: 1. Offered salary of \$7,000 per year.

Answer: 1. Was offered and received salary of \$5,370 per year during entire period of employment.

Allegation: 2. Given a 12-room furnished house for personal use.

Answer: 2. Lived in 10-room furnished requisitioned house, not paid for by United States Government funds, which was only American house in area to be used for official entertainment of German groups in connection with employee's basic duties.

Allegation: 3. Was given a maid, butler, and gardener.

Answer: 3. Had use of housekeeper and combination fireman-gardener, not paid from United States Government funds, who were primarily supplied for maintenance of



requisitioned property. No other maintenance employees were authorized.

Allegation: 4. Supplied with chauffeur and automobile.

Answer: 4. Had official car and German driver, not paid for from United States appropriated funds, to enable him to cover his duties in two Kreise (counties). One Kreis, Buchen, includes 82 towns and an area of approximately 500 square miles. The other Kreis, Tauberbischofsheim, includes approximately 75 towns and an area of approximately 450 square miles.

Allegation: 5. Obtained free laundry and cleaning.

Answer: 5. No free laundry or cleaning service was authorized or provided.

Allegation: 6. United States Government paid personal telephone bill.

Answer: 6. United States Government did not authorize or pay for personal telephone service. An official telephone was provided which had an extension to employee's residence to permit him to transact necessary business there after office hours. Use of phone for personal business except at personal expense entirely unauthorized.

Allegation: 7. Received extra \$100 a month for entertainment money.

Answer: 7. Received maximum of 125 marks (approximately \$30) per month per kreis for official representation expenses, in meeting with or entertaining German officials and other German groups in connection with the reorientation program. Not paid from United States appropriated funds.

Allegation: 8. Received 10 percent of his salary as differential bonus.

Answer: 8. All United States Government employees in Germany at the time of State Department take-over received 10 percent salary differential, which was eliminated in March 1950 on basis of change in circumstances.

Allegation: 9. Had no duties. Went fishing one day, picnicking the next, drinking the next, played golf the next, loafed the next, and then took off for the week end.

Answer: 9. This employee had many duties assigned to him. Instructions were issued to him in numerous HICOG directives and during several conferences. During his period of employment of approximately 1 year, this employee submitted 149 signed reports explaining the performance of his duties in great detail. In addition, during this entire period he initialed time sheets certifying that he had performed such duties during all required hours of work and usually indicating substantial overtime work.

Allegation: 10. Resigned because he got tired of robbing United States taxpayers.

Answer: 10. Required to resign under State Department policy because of announced intention to marry German national. Employee wrote several letters to the High Commissioner and had a personal interview with the High Commissioner in a strong effort to hold his job, and in one letter to the United States High Commissioner stated, "I believe in our mission here and have energetically attempted to carry it out."

UNITED STATES HIGH  
COMMISSIONER FOR GERMANY,  
New York, N. Y., July 21, 1951.

The Honorable DEAN G. ACHESON,  
Secretary of State.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: My attention has been drawn to a letter from a former employee of this office addressed to Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 30, 1951.

The writer of this letter is a former Kreis (county) resident officer who transferred from United States Military Government in October 1949 and who resigned his position in September 1950. He resigned his position in accordance with State Department regula-

tions following his marriage to a German citizen. Interviews with his supervisor and information from the files of this office indicate that the writer, quite in contrast to the statements in his letter, submitted over a hundred written reports on activities in his Kreis and organized more than 165 German civic groups for community activities in his area. He had a reputation, both with his United States supervisors and the citizens of his Kreis, of one who took his responsibilities seriously.

The admissions made in his letter are, of course, quite inconsistent with the records he left behind when he resigned. If they were true, they would indicate that he abused his position of responsibility and, in fact, accepted his pay as a government employee under false and fraudulent pretenses. I do not believe that this is the case. On the contrary, I believe that the writer has exaggerated his argument, not realizing, perhaps, that to anyone who knows the facts, the main impression to be derived from his letter reflects most unfavorably on himself.

This man occupied a position of responsibility and trust as the representative of the United States in his area. He necessarily enjoyed a considerable amount of latitude and discretion in performing his duties. His position in this regard was not dissimilar to that of an ambassador or consul in the United States Foreign Service, an officer commanding United States troops abroad, or, for that matter, to that of the foreign representative of a United States newspaper or business firm. All such persons occupying offices of responsibility in isolated areas may abuse the discretion and independence vested in them by nonperformance of their duty, and undoubtedly some do. In most cases such derelictions are discovered and the offenders are removed from office. Under the system of field supervision of United States resident officers in Germany, such admitted nonperformance of duty as described by this writer would have been detected in due course. This is one reason why I do not believe that his letter can be accepted as a true picture of his conduct.

Because our kreis resident officers are vested with such a high degree of personal initiative and responsibility, they have to be carefully selected, are given extensive training, and are subject to frequent inspection. Perhaps a brief summary of the typical duties of such an officer will give a better picture of what the problem is.

As United States representative in his area, the Kreis resident office is charged with the duty of carrying out all phases of the United States mission in the fields of democratization, administration, reporting and observing for my various functional offices. He studies conditions and developments in his area, recommends or takes action in accordance with governing policies, and acts in my name or that of the United States Land Commissioner. He plans and directs democratization programs including the organization of public assemblies, German-American clubs, youth, school, church, and cultural activities which will foster and encourage democratic concepts among the German population. He observes, evaluates, and reports on political activities and personalities, being alert for rightist and leftist trends, evidence of resurgence of nazism, or Communist activities. He works closely with local government officials, advising and assisting them in adopting good governmental practices. He explains to the population or refers to the proper agency questions involving Marshall-plan policies, the benefits derived from it, and any other economic matters requiring clarification. He acts as official liaison officer on all problems requiring coordination between United States military agencies, elements of the other occupying powers, German govern-

mental agencies, and this office, such as police and traffic matters, requisitioned property, incidents involving troops and German citizens, and problems of displaced persons. In this capacity he renders decisions based on policies of this office and generally acts as mediator. In isolated areas he acts as committing magistrate for the United States courts in Germany with power to fix bail and commit prisoners for trial.

In addition to the writer's unsuccessful attempt (in my opinion) to brand himself a slacker who failed to perform the duties for which he was paid by the United States taxpayer, he has made certain claims about his living arrangements which, for the sake of the record, should be set straight. Resident officers, like most United States Government employees (including the military) in Germany, live in property requisitioned from the German community. Their duties, as outlined above, require representation activities with German groups which in turn call for quarters adequate for entertainment, meetings, and the like. The writer, actually, was quartered in a ten-room house which was furnished. In addition, he was provided with a quarters attendant, paid out of German occupation costs, who performed ordinary housekeeping duties. He was also furnished a combination janitor, furnace tender, and gardener, paid out of occupation costs, whose duty was to preserve the grounds and tend the furnace. These services are standard throughout the occupation. He was not provided with a butler or personal servant, unless he hired them himself and paid their salaries. He was not furnished dry cleaning and laundry services unless he misused the housekeeping staff for this purpose. As a resident officer, he was entitled to an official automobile and a German driver, which under United States regulations may be used only for the conduct of official business. Resident officers pay for their private telephone service, but he may have had an extension from his office telephone installed in his quarters to be used for official business only. When the State Department assumed responsibility for the civilian occupation of Germany, all United States Government employees there were receiving a differential of 10 percent of their salaries. This was eliminated in March 1950 after surveys showed there were no longer sufficient grounds in the United States zone of Germany for such a differential. Finally, neither Mr. Bowers, nor any resident officer, has ever received \$100 per month entertainment allowance. Because of the representation responsibilities of this office, as described above, I have authorized a sum of up to 125 deutschemarks, or about \$30 per month, for each Kreis. The expenditure of these funds must be vouchered and certified by the officer as having been used for carrying out his official duties as described in State Department regulations.

Finally, I wish to go on record as stating my personal opinion that the work of the United States resident officers is of vital importance to the carrying out of the United States mission in Western Germany. They serve in areas of great tension, such as counties along the border of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet zone of Germany. These jobs are far from being sinecures. In fact, in addition to the elements of tension, the resident officer and his family are never free from actual personal danger. Regardless of what the future in Germany holds, it is my firm conviction that the resident officers have contributed magnificently to sowing the seeds of real democracy and civic consciousness at the local level or grass roots of this country.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. McCLOY,  
United States High  
Commissioner for Germany.



(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For expenses necessary to enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States pursuant to conventions between the United States and Canada signed May 26, 1930 (50 Stat. 1355) and January 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 1351), treaties between the United States and Great Britain, in respect to Canada, signed January 11, 1909 (36 Stat. 2448) and February 24, 1925 (44 Stat. 2102), the treaty between the United States and Canada signed February 27, 1950, and Convention between the United States and Costa Rica signed May 31, 1949, including stenographic reporting services by contract; hire of passenger motor vehicles; the United States share of the expenses of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, the International Fisheries Commission, and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, which except for the expenses of the members, may be advanced to the respective Commissions; \$702,000, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State and to be available also for additional expenses of the American Sections, International Commissions, as hereinafter set forth:

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: Page 2, line 13, after the semicolon, strike out "\$702,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$682,000."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the membership from California and the other coastal States, I may state that this is an amendment to reduce the item for the Tuna Fish Commission from \$50,000 to \$30,000.

Many representatives of the fishing industry and their local representatives have been to see many Members of Congress and members of the committee. The tuna-fishing industry is one of the most important industries in our country. The catch is increasing; the tuna fleet is increasing, but there are some problems with our neighbors to the south, not in the matter of catching the tuna fish but because the industry has no trouble about getting the tuna; their problem is getting the bait.

The tuna-fishing industry is a very interesting one. Motion pictures have been made of its operation which are some of the best pictures I have ever seen. Some still pictures are here on the desk which I think all of the Members present ought to see. They are most interesting and indicate the rapid growth of that industry. But, as I say, the problem is not the catching of the tuna; it is the problem of getting the bait. Tuna does not rise to artificial lures; in other words, you cannot use artificial bait and catch tuna; the tuna rises to live bait only. The seining of the bait is hazardous and costly because sharks and other large fish damage the nets. Seines are used to catch the small

bait fish which are found along the coasts of Centra and South America. The tuna fishermen pay large sums to the governments of those countries along the coasts to catch this live bait which they put into tanks, take it out to sea, throw it into the water when they get near a school of tuna. The live bait trying to escape the tuna, seek the protection of the shadow of the tuna boat and are followed by the tuna. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] tells me the tuna schools sometimes one pole, sometimes two poles each long. The tuna fisherman uses sometimes one pole, sometimes two poles each with a barbless hook baited with a little feather and only one line. It is a most interesting type of fishing. The real problem is to get the live bait and agreements with our neighbors to the south.

We now have two international fish commissions that have done a remarkable work in connection with the salmon and the halibut. Our relations with Canada on salmon and halibut have been unusually fine. It is a cooperative proposition; we pay 50 percent of the expense and Canada pays the other 50. In the tuna program, however, it was brought to our attention that they wanted to set up a similar commission on a cooperative basis. But this cooperative basis would be 98 percent of the expenses to be borne by Uncle Sam and 2 percent by some other country in South and Central America, namely, Costa Rica.

The tuna fish industry should be satisfied with the amount we have in this amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the remarks of the able gentleman from Nebraska are very substantial proof of justification of the action of the committee which reduced this requested appropriation from \$338,000 to \$50,000. I agree with practically everything he says except his statement that the tuna fish industry will be satisfied with an appropriation in the amount of \$30,000. I do not understand that to be the fact. I understand that if we are going to appropriate as small a sum as that we might as well not appropriate any money at all.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman may be right but I got the impression that they could get along with \$30,000. The gentleman may have some other information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I am told that the Congress is going to be called upon in the near future to create a commission on sardines, a commission on mackerel, a commission on sea bass, a commission on shrimp and others. Perhaps that is all right, perhaps we

will have to go into that because of the importance of the fishing industry, but we cannot afford it at this time. This is not a defense item, we must economize. The chairman of this committee and the members were told that it would cost us a half million dollars a year forever if we did embark upon the program suggested by the State Department in setting up the Tuna Fish Commission.

All the tuna fishermen want now is live bait.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. I take it from the gentleman that one reason he is suggesting this reduction to \$30,000 is because he understands the tuna industry is willing to accept it.

Mr. STEFAN. That was my impression.

Mr. DOYLE. My congressional area encompasses Long Beach and Los Angeles County and the tuna representatives there have made it very clear to me that this particular commission to which the gentleman refers and which is just getting under way cannot possibly function on less than \$50,000.

Mr. STEFAN. They told us before they could not function on less than a half million dollars.

Mr. DOYLE. But I wish to make it clear to the House that I am sure my accurate information is that the tuna industry, which the gentleman compliments so highly, cannot get along on less than \$50,000 at this time.

Mr. STEFAN. The sardine industry and the mackerel industry and the other industries are getting along without anything.

Mr. DOYLE. The gentleman is to be complimented for the success of the two other commissions that have been formed.

Mr. STEFAN. They function on a 50-50 basis. In this case we pay 98 percent as against 2 percent.

Mr. DOYLE. The gentleman will stipulate, I am sure, that this commission is just getting started and with the only other party to the agreement at this time being Costa Rica, it is understandable why your own country at least this year has to pay the greater part of it. I urge that this proposed reduction be defeated.

Mr. STEFAN. Well, we were told that we would have to pay 98 percent forever. That is different from the cooperative program as regards halibut and salmon.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SCUDDER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the



last 5 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] which would take away \$20,000 from the \$50,000 allowed in this bill for scientific studies in the tuna industry.

American fishermen last year caught 360,000,000 pounds of tuna. These catches made possible a tuna pack of more than 9,000,000 cases. This pack at wholesale prices was valued at \$112,000,000. The tuna industry employs 23,000 people.

Many of you will be interested and surprised to know that tuna, both in poundage and in dollar value, is our largest American food fishing industry. Last year's take of tuna was 40,000,000 pounds larger than the total take of salmon from Pacific, Atlantic, and Alaskan waters. Whereas the wholesale value of last year's tuna catch was \$112,000,000, the total salmon value, at wholesale, was \$104,000,000, or \$8,000,000 less than the value of that year's tuna haul.

There are only two fishing operations that yield more poundage than tuna. These are the catching of menhaden, confined most to the Gulf of Mexico, and of pilchard-sardines. The menhaden are not food fish but are used in making oil, fish meal, and fertilizer. While some pilchard are canned as sardines, most of the catch of these goes into oil and meal. This leaves the tuna, in both poundage and money value, the No. 1 fishing industry of the United States.

In this bill we ask for only \$50,000 to start a scientific study of the habits of the tuna, about which little is known to date, so that the supply of tuna may be perpetuated and kept at a high level.

Twenty-three years ago the halibut industry of this country appeared to be on its last legs. Catches were declining year after year. Congress appropriated money for scientific studies of the halibut, just as we now ask \$50,000 for studies of the tuna. As a result of the scientific studies of halibut, made with congressional appropriations, the halibut fishing industry has been revived. Government agents and the fishing all agree that the halibut industry has been rebuilt as a result of these scientific studies.

Last year this Congress provided \$120,000 for further studies of the halibut. In this bill we ask only for \$50,000 to begin studies of tuna although the tuna industry is a \$112,000,000-a-year industry whereas the halibut industry is only one-fourth that size.

I would like to point out to the Members of the House that of the \$112,000,000 gross income of the American tuna industry last year, about \$20,000,000 was paid to the Federal Government in taxes. The Federal Government is the principal beneficiary, as a result of the taxes it gets, from the prosperity of this indus-

try. The \$50,000 we ask in this bill to start a scientific study of the tuna industry, represents only one-fourth of 1 percent, only \$1 in every \$400, that the Government collects in taxes from the great tuna industry.

I hope that the House will reject the gentleman from Nebraska's amendment to reduce the \$50,000 asked to \$30,000.

(Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

#### RED HERRINGS

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] a question. The gentleman has enumerated various fish commissions, such as the sardine commission, the tuna commission, and others. Why not establish a commission on red herrings, since this is a State Department issue?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we have a Commission on Epizootics.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] made a statement that we were being asked to supply 98 percent of the money for this venture and that Costa Rica was only asked to supply 2 percent. Does the gentleman know that Costa Rica has only one small tuna cannery whereas we have hundreds in the United States?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio could explain to the House what the word "epizootics" means.

Mr. BENDER. My friend, I will have to refer that to Mr. Acheson.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for an explanation, it means epidemics among animals.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, despite the statements of the gentleman from Nebraska the outlook for the future welfare of the tuna fisheries is not as bright as he has indicated. Several problems confront the industry which can adversely affect its future. I cannot enumerate them in the brief time allotted to me. But I would like to point out to the Members the discrepancy which exists in the amount of money the Federal Government spends in behalf of agricultural food products and fishery food products. For every ton of agricultural food products produced in this country the Government spends about \$5.80. But for every ton of fishery food products the Government spends only about 80 or 90 cents. These figures are furnished by the research section of the Fish and Wildlife Service and are based upon appropriations made by Congress. This discrepancy is too great. Our fish-

ery food resources are tremendously important to our economy, and they will become increasingly so. Because of the attitude and neglect of our Government we have already lost some segments of the industry. Some of the New England fisheries have moved their operations to Canada. It is entirely possible that if we neglect our tuna fisheries some of our operations may move to Central America and elsewhere. That would result not only in loss of employment to Americans engaged in tuna fisheries but in loss also to the United States Treasury of a large amount of tax revenue. We must preserve our fishery resources and protect an important segment of our domestic industry. I trust the amendment to cut the funds for the Inter-Tropical Tuna Commission will be defeated.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I may say to the gentleman from Washington that I am becoming a bit suspicious that perhaps the committee made a mistake with regard to this item. There are so many interested in a \$50,000 item in a billion dollar bill that I am beginning to smell pork barrel. I wonder if we could not condense this and get along.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I refuse to yield any further.

I call the attention of the House to one fact in connection with the amount of money the Federal Government spends in support of food products. With respect to agricultural food products, the Federal Government spends \$5.80 to \$6 per ton. With respect to fish food products the Federal Government spends only about 80 cents per ton. I think there is too large a discrepancy there.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. Is it not true that the development of this tuna industry has progressed northward on the Pacific coast on a scale unprecedented in the past few years?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is correct.

I trust this amendment is defeated. The \$50,000 is too low as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

(Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, the value of canned tuna last year was in excess of \$112,000,000.

I think the gentlemen in this House from the agricultural States, especially ought to be willing to recognize that when they ask us frequently to favorably consider the love life of cotton seed and the love life of the peanuts their part of our great Nation so depends upon economically, they ought to be willing to now consider the great tuna industry and the love life of the fish tuna which, as has been stated is the greatest fish industry in this country in dollars and cents.



I respectfully urge the defeat of this amendment, reducing the \$50,000 to only \$30,000.

The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior has budgeted funds under those sections of its 1951-52 budget known as Administration of Fish and Game Laws, Propagation, and Distribution of Food Fishes, Coastal and Offshore Fishery Research, Commercial Shellfishery Research, Inland Fishery Research and Design Fish Protective Devices to cover work in the following fisheries: Salmon, Alaska; salmon, Sacramento River; Salmon, Atlantic; salmon, Columbia River; shad and related species, Atlantic; pilchards, Pacific coast; tuna, Pacific Oceana-Trust Territories; tuna, Gulf of Mexico; shrimp, Gulf of Mexico; oysters, New England; oysters, Middle Atlantic; oysters, Gulf of Mexico, albacore, North Pacific; blue-fin tuna, New England; clams, Maine; halibut, North Pacific.

In addition other work is performed in the conduct of fish hatcheries in 42 States, in fishery technological studies and other fields of benefit to the fishing industry of the United States.

The tuna industry of the Pacific coast is vital to the food product supply of our entire population. Listen to these material facts:

Area of operations: The albacore fishery extends off the coasts of Washington, Oregon, California, and Mexico. The yellowfin and skipjack fishery, providing the major percentage of production, extends from the high seas waters off southern California to the high seas waters off the coast of Peru.

Production: Production by American vessels totaled approximately 360,000,000 pounds in 1950. Production by American processors of canned goods totaled over 9,000,000 cases in 1950.

Value: The value of the canned-goods production in 1950 was in excess of \$112,000,000.

Employment: Full-time employment in tuna-fishing operations exceeds 4,000 persons. Employment in fish-processing activity such as the seasonal operations in the albacore fishery approximates 5,000 persons. Employment in fish processing plants approximates 8,000 persons. Employment in ship repair and other service industries approximates 4,000 persons.

Start of the tuna fishery: The tuna fishery of the eastern Pacific has been entirely the product of private enterprise. The development of canned tuna has been entirely an American undertaking. The United States market has been developed solely by American industry and last year was supplied by more than 9,000,000 cases of American production and 2,000,000 cases of imported tuna and tunalike products, a total of 11,000,000 cases or over 525,000,000 cans.

The United States Government has maintained a necessary, continuous, and expanding interest in the preservation of its natural resources upon which much of the economy depends. This interest has been manifested through scientific study and proper utilization of the resources. The heart of the many

studies in many fields lies in the knowledge produced by effective, hard work. That is what this money will do in this field. It is a fruitful field for a small sum.

Fisheries, both commercial and sport, are an important part of the natural resources of our Nation. The Government, through the Department of the Interior, has undertaken work in most of the fisheries fields. It is consistent to do this.

In those fisheries lying in the international field, the Government has participated through international commissions based upon treaties. These activities involving international commitments are budgeted under the Department of State and include such activities as that of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, the International Fisheries Commission (Halibut), the International Whaling Commission, and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. It is admitted these commissions have rendered real worth to the economy.

In fiscal 1951 work was started on the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, which originated in a treaty with Costa Rica. It was an important beginning.

The function of this particular Commission is to do what is basic to all work in the natural resources field, that is, to gather the information necessary to the understanding, preservation and utilization of that resource. For many years the fishery groups of the Pacific coast have urged the consummation of a tuna fishery treaty, and this is the first concrete result. Time in such matters is important—in a fishery, work should be started before there is distress occasioned by a declining catch. In this particular fishery it is important because the investigation arises from a treaty commitment. Because of this treaty commitment, it is important to our international relationships that the work now undertaken in part be continued as intended. To abruptly terminate this relationship is too expensive an experiment and serves no good end.

Inasmuch as the tuna fishery is international in character, there is a community of interest of several nations. Inasmuch as American vessels enter the territorial waters of several nations, there is active, specific interest on the part of those nations. The taking of fish in national and high seas waters has the characteristic of many other activities in which several other nations are interested; it is a fertile field for misunderstanding. The misunderstandings which arise in fisheries are caused for the most part by a rather complete lack of knowledge of the fishery involved. In the tuna fishery, the Tuna Commission has been activated for the purpose of remedying a deficiency of scientific knowledge. It is necessary to acquire this knowledge.

In the conduct of the Commission's work and the consequent development of a field of knowledge, a wiser use can be made of this fishery resource. The basic cause of dispute, lack of knowledge, will be fully met with a resultant diminution of any potential for conflict. We

will thus serve a dual purpose in preserving a valuable natural resource and in preserving a valuable international relationship. It is a wise investment.

The minority subcommittee ranking member cannot achieve one cent of saving in this item. It would be a definite loss of sound judgment and a misapplied idea of saving an insignificant sum comparatively.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska to reduce the appropriation requested by the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission to bring about agreements between the various countries off whose shores tuna are caught.

The tuna is the most popular fish that fills the grocery shelves of our country, is the best seller, and is more favorably known than any other food fish throughout our entire country. The 1950 catch exceeded 360,000,000 pounds, valued at \$112,000,000, and employment in connection with the harvesting and processing exceeds 20,000 people. It is a new industry, so to speak, and is located mainly along the Pacific coast. Fish are caught and processed in California, Oregon, and Washington.

Only recently these fish have been discovered as having migrated as far as Alaska. Until the last few years these fish were not known to travel above Monterey Bay. However, since the advent of the short-wave radio fishermen have gone further to sea and found the fish migrate as far as Alaska. This industry should be thoroughly investigated as to their habits, where they travel, and their life cycle. The scientists can render a great service to the American producer and consumer because tuna is one of the most delicate food fish we have today. We have seen salmon almost disappear from the market. The sardines are being depleted, and as sardines are used to chum the tuna by the fishermen they many times have to put into foreign ports for fresh supplies. These are some of the problems facing this industry. Therefore, I ask that the full appropriation be retained to carry on this necessary program.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I think my amendment should be agreed to, for the reason that this industry is getting preferential treatment by the committee. I feel that \$682,000 for this international commission should be sufficient money. We must practice economy on all of our nondefense activities. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON].

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] for his kind intentions so far as this problem is concerned. Briefly, the problem simply is this. As our boats go fishing for tuna, we have



discovered that tuna is being played immediately off the west coast of the United States, and the boats have to fish further and further away to find the tuna. We have established a big industry in tuna, an industry that is purely American. That industry has been established in the last 30 years. It is a very romantic industry and typical of free American enterprise and developed from scratch through the initiative of our people and with their own investment of money. These fish are getting further and further away from the coast. We are beginning to discover that we need to know a lot more things about their propagation. We also find out as we fish further away that we must run into Mexican and South and Central American countries' waters to pick up bait with which we chum for tuna. As we go into these foreign waters we encounter international complications with various countries. The idea of having this commission is simply to have the various countries affected sit down with us and figure out the rules of the game. We need to have a code of procedure.

It is true that we pay the largest share of this cost, but in turn we take about 99 percent of the benefits too. I think it is very logical that we should bear the larger share of the cost in proportion to the benefits we get back. The tuna industry is a multimillion-dollar investment. It provides a \$112,000,000 annual income. It means a great deal so far as our food supplies are concerned and it means a great deal to the individual housewife. Also, it means a great deal to industry, and provides employment for many people. Starting from \$338,000, which was requested, and being cut down to \$50,000 leaves the Commission very little to operate on. Now, to take off another \$20,000 makes me wonder if that is real economy. We all know that we can prune a tree, but if you prune it too closely you are going to lose the tree. If we cut this down too closely, the entire \$30,000 can go for naught.

So I ask the consideration of the House to go along on the \$50,000 contained in the bill, and defeat this amendment. The \$20,000 additional is not going to break the economy of the United States in these times of million-dollar and billion-dollar expenditures, but it can keep alive a very vital industry on our west coast. It is not new to try to preserve our natural industries and natural resources. Twenty thousand dollars would certainly go a long way toward maintaining this Commission and building better international relations so that the tuna-fishing industry will be continued.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made a very, very impressive statement. In Massachusetts, we have the same problem concerning the habits and the life and propagation of the fish, and so forth. The fishing industry requires a great deal of research and the gentleman has put his finger on a very vital point that we must pursue,

if we are going to help this great fishing industry.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I want to tell the gentleman that the Pacific coast is not the only place that has tuna fish. On the Atlantic coast, way up as far as Maine, all along the New England coast, the waters are infested with tuna fish, and we believe that there ought to be a little research on that to find out what the habits of the fish are so that we will not lose the annual catch of fish that we are getting.

Mr. McKINNON. I am glad that Massachusetts shares our problem.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I fully agree that we should study the tuna fish, but it is hard to understand why it comes in the State Department category. I would like some light on that question.

Mr. McKINNON. I will try to explain that. This is an inter-South American-North American conference. We included Costa Rica and several other South American countries in this commission. This is not purely a domestic proposition. It is an international proposition. That is why it fits into the State Department rather than the Department of the Interior.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to enable the Commission to settle certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments as authorized by Public Law 455, approved March 10, 1950, including expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purpose of this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles for field use only; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and employment of aliens; \$150,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a little disturbed at the reduction in the amount for the International Claims Commission, which I understand is financed through funds frozen in this country and which are necessary at this time to carry out the tenets which the Congress has laid down for its administration.

I would like at this time to revise and extend my remarks so that overnight the House may have the benefit of the situation as it exists in this particular agency.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, page 6 of House Report No. 685, Eighty-second Congress, first session, accompanying H. R. 4740, appropriations for State, Justice, Commerce, and the Ju-

diciary for the fiscal year 1952 reads as follows:

#### INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

The bill includes \$150,000 for this Commission, a reduction of \$115,000 below the amount of the budget estimate. While no funds were included for this activity in the 1951 appropriations, there was \$240,000 appropriated in the Deficiency Act, 1950, which was to provide for expenses for a portion of 1950 and the fiscal year 1951. [The committee was advised that there was a substantial unobligated balance of these funds on June 30, 1951.] The Commission was established by the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, for the purpose of adjudicating the claims of American nationals against the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia which deposited \$17,000,000 with the United States to cover payment of these claims. The act provides that 3 percent of the claims payments may be covered into the Treasury to offset administrative expenses. The committee reiterates more forcibly than ever that it expects the Commission to carry on and complete its work within the 3 percent allowance and thus at no cost whatever to the American taxpayer.

With reference to the above statement in brackets, the members of the Commission took office August 28, 1950. Plans were immediately made to recruit the personnel authorized in the Deficiency Act, 1950, referred to above. The attached exhibit A indicates the accession of the personnel.

This slow rate of accession of personnel over the 9-month period from September 1950 to June 1951 is attributable in part to the normal personnel processing, as well as to the desire of the Commission to add personnel only as the anticipated volume of claims increased. Furthermore, it must be kept in mind that although legislation establishing the Commission was approved March 10, 1950, the members of the Commission did not take office until about September 1, 1950, having been sworn in on August 28, 1950. The \$240,000 appropriated under the Deficiency Act of 1950 was to provide funds for May and June 1950, and for the fiscal year 1951. Thus, approximately 4 months of the deficiency appropriation had lapsed before the Commission was established. These two factors account for approximately \$55,000 of the unexpended balance of approximately \$95,000 on hand on June 30, 1951. The remaining \$40,000 of the \$95,000 unobligated balance on hand as of June 30, 1951, was set aside as required by law—section 1214, Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

Exhibit B indicates the positions which must be abolished, effective August 15 in order to adjust the current rate of expenditures to fit the reduced appropriation as proposed in H. R. 4740.

Exhibit C reflects the adjustments which it is estimated must be made, on a dollar basis, to meet the reduction of \$115,000 in the appropriation bill as reported by the House Appropriations Committee.

Positionwise, the recommended reduction in appropriations requires a reduction of the present Commission staff in Washington from 29, including the members of the Commission, to 11, and of the staff in Yugoslavia from 5 to



2, or an over-all reduction of over 60 percent. This staff is highly trained and experienced. Our general counsel, solicitor, and associate solicitor are faculty members in the Catholic University Law School.

At the time of the appearance of the Commission before the House Appropriations Committee in March in support of the budget request for \$265,000, there were but 65 claims filed. Between that date and June 30—the deadline date for filing claims under the Yugoslav Claims Agreement of 1948—an additional 1,322 claims were filed, totaling in all, 1,387 claims.

In addition to the Yugoslav claims, the Commission must also undertake to receive, examine, and adjudicate about 267 claims arising under a claims convention with the Government of the Republic of Panama, which came into force on October 11, 1950.

At the time when the proposed legislation to establish the Commission was pending in Congress, it was represented by the State Department that the total number of possible claimants was about 1,400 and that the estimated claims against the \$17,000,000 fund would total about \$40,000,000. The actual number of claims now filed is 1,387—with upwards of 20 requests for extension of time to file—but these filed claims total about \$75,000,000 instead of \$40,000,000. The claims range in nature from those of small amounts involving farms, dwellings, and small shops, to those involving large industrial enterprises where the amounts claimed aggregate millions of dollars.

Under the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, each claimant is entitled to a hearing before the Commission. Furthermore, except as otherwise provided in the act, all proceedings must be conducted in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946.

Manifestly, these claims cannot be disposed of summarily. Under the act, each decision of the Commission must be in accordance with the provisions of the applicable settlement agreement and the applicable principles of international law, justice, and equity. The Commission must act judiciously in each case. Evidence as to citizenship, ownership, and valuation must be gathered in each claim before any action can be taken. Most of this evidence is available only in Yugoslavia, particularly with respect to ownership and valuation. No claims have as yet been processed to the final stage for adjudication, but considerable examination has been had.

This is the first domestic tribunal established by the United States to adjudicate individual claims against a fund paid over by a foreign government in en bloc settlement of the several claims of American nationals against the foreign government. The task confronting the members of the Commission is a serious one. Under the recommended appropriation, they will be left—exclusive of the three commissioners and their stenographers—with but five employees, principally stenographic and clerical, in Washington, and two employees in Yugoslavia.

At the rate of expenditure for the last quarter of 1951, the sum of \$265,000 is necessary if the Commission is to efficiently carry out its essential functions. Under existing conditions the Commission is faced with the prospect that it will lose its staff of highly trained and carefully selected personnel.

Even if the proposed budget cut of \$115,000 were to be subsequently restored by Congress in a deficiency appropriation, the Commission will have lost its experienced personnel, and the recruitment of new personnel later would be time-consuming and uneconomical.

The American citizens whose property has been taken, and whose claims for compensation are to be adjudicated by this Commission, will with this reduced appropriation be the ones who will suffer most.

#### EXHIBIT A

##### 1950:

August (28)—3:  
Commissioner (Chairman) --- \$15,000  
Commissioner --- 15,000  
Commissioner --- 15,000

October—5:  
Executive director, GS-15 --- 10,000  
Administrative assistant,  
GS-5 --- 3,475  
Stenographer, GS-3 --- 2,650  
Attorney adviser, GS-7 --- 3,825  
Secretary, GS-5 --- 3,725

November—3:  
General counsel, GS-15 --- 10,000  
Secretary, GS-9 --- 4,725  
Attorney adviser, GS-7 --- 3,825

##### 1951:

January—9:  
Attorney adviser, GS-7 --- 3,825  
Secretary, GS-9 --- 4,600  
Clerk of Commission, GS-12 --- 6,400  
Clerk-typist, GS-3 --- 3,130  
Solicitor, GS-15 --- 10,000  
Associate solicitor, GS-15 --- 10,000  
Secretary, GS-4 --- 3,355  
Attorney adviser, GS-7 --- 3,825  
(Field office) Trial attorney,  
GS-13 --- 7,600

February—3:  
Attorney adviser (WAE),  
GS-11 --- 5,400  
Secretary, GS-5 --- 3,350  
Secretary, GS-4 --- 2,875

March—5:  
Trial attorney, GS-11 --- 5,400  
Secretary, GS-5 --- 3,350  
Trial attorney, GS-13 --- 7,600  
Trial attorney, GS-11 --- 5,400  
Business economist, GS-14 --- 9,000

April—5:  
Three Americans:  
Trial attorney (field),  
GS-15 --- 10,000  
Investigator (field), GS-9 --- 4,600  
Clerk ---  
Two locals:  
Clerk-translator --- 1,860  
Chauffeur --- 1,320

May—1: Clerk - stenographer,  
GS-4 --- 3,115  
June—1: Clerk-stenographer, GS-  
3 --- 2,650

#### EXHIBIT B

##### International Claims Commission of the United States

##### LIST OF PERSONNEL

Offices of the Commissioners:  
Chairman --- \$15,000  
Secretary, GS-9 --- 4,600  
Commissioner --- 15,000  
Secretary, GS-9 --- 4,725  
Commissioner --- 15,000  
Secretary, GS-9 --- 4,600  
Total --- 58,925

##### Office of the Executive Director:

Executive Director,<sup>1</sup> GS-15 --- \$10,000  
Administrative assistant, GS-7 --- 3,825  
Secretary,<sup>1</sup> GS-5 --- 3,100  
Clerk of Commission,<sup>1</sup> GS-12 --- 6,400  
Clerk-typist, GS-4 --- 3,130  
Clerk-stenographer,<sup>1</sup> GS-3 --- 2,650  
Total --- 29,105

##### Office of General Counsel:

General Counsel, GS-15 --- 10,000  
Secretary,<sup>1</sup> GS-5 --- 3,350  
Total --- 13,350

##### Office of Solicitor:

Solicitor,<sup>1</sup> GS-15 --- 10,000  
Associate Solicitor,<sup>1</sup> GS-15 --- 10,000  
Consultant on Yugoslav law,<sup>1</sup>  
GS-11 --- 5,400  
Trial attorney,<sup>1</sup> GS-13 --- 7,600  
Trial attorney,<sup>1</sup> GS-11 --- 5,400  
Attorney adviser,<sup>1</sup> GS-7 --- 3,825  
Attorney adviser,<sup>1</sup> GS-9 --- 4,600  
Attorney adviser,<sup>1</sup> GS-9 --- 4,600  
Secretary, GS-5 --- 3,475  
Secretary,<sup>1</sup> GS-4 --- 2,875  
Secretary,<sup>1</sup> GS-4 --- 3,115  
Clerk-typist,<sup>1</sup> GS-3 --- 3,130  
Total --- 64,020

##### Investigation and valuation division:

Chief,<sup>2</sup> GS-14 --- 9,000  
Attorney adviser, GS-9 --- 4,600  
Secretary,<sup>1</sup> GS-5 --- 3,350  
Total --- 16,950

##### Belgrade office:

Special representative,<sup>1</sup> GS-15 --- 10,000  
Alternate special representative,  
GS-13 --- 7,600  
Translator,<sup>1</sup> GS-9 --- 4,600  
Clerk-translator, local, FSL-2 --- 1,860  
Chauffeur, local,<sup>1</sup> FSL-4 --- 1,320  
Total --- 25,380

Grand total --- 207,730

<sup>1</sup> To be terminated August 15, 1951.

<sup>2</sup> To be converted to WAE consultant not to exceed \$6,000 per annum.

#### EXHIBIT C

##### Current rate:

Salaries (Washington) --- \$182,350  
Salaries (overseas) --- 45,199  
227,499

##### Other objects:

Travel --- \$18,200  
Transportation of  
things --- 1,500  
Communications --- 3,000  
Printing and reproduction --- 4,000  
Other contractual services --- 5,000  
Supplies --- 6,000  
37,700

265,199

Recommended appropriation --- 150,000  
Less amount needed through August 15, 1951, to comply with CSC regulations providing for 30 days' notice of termination --- 33,000

Net amount available August 15, 1951, through June 30, 1952 --- 117,000

Amount required at present rates and grades for the present 34 employees, including Commissioners—going rate 10½ months:  
Personal services --- \$199,719  
Other objects --- 32,480

232,199



|                                                                                                   |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Less amount available.....                                                                        | \$117,000 |
| Amount to be made up through reduction in force and corresponding reduction in other objects..... | 115,199   |
| Savings projected on 10½-month basis:                                                             |           |
| Personal services (Washington) ..                                                                 | 79,861    |
| Personal services (overseas) .....                                                                | 23,643    |
|                                                                                                   | 103,504   |
| Less reserve for terminal leave.....                                                              | 13,136    |
|                                                                                                   | 90,368    |
| Other objects:                                                                                    |           |
| Travel.....                                                                                       | \$14,000  |
| Communications.....                                                                               | 2,000     |
| Printing and reproduction.....                                                                    | 4,000     |
| Contractual services.....                                                                         | 2,500     |
| Supplies.....                                                                                     | 2,500     |
|                                                                                                   | 25,000    |
| Estimated savings.....                                                                            | 115,368   |

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I did not get around in time to talk about the tuna fish amendment, but I am in favor of doing everything reasonable to protect the fish, get more fish, get fish food. Man all too often follows a destructive policy in connection with nature's gifts.

I have had several wires and letters from Michigan recently from members of the conservation department, State officials, and others requesting that I vote for appropriations for the Department of the Interior to aid them in giving us a policy which will enable them to protect wildlife of all kinds in Michigan. A policy of that nature I favor. I have not answered them yet, but I will this week, if I can find time, if there are not too many committee meetings and too many sessions of the House. I intend to tell them that first things come first—I am not going to vote for any more Federal money for the State of Michigan Conservation Department until they at least begin to clean up the rivers in Michigan. That problem they have ignored in large measure for at least the last 25 years.

I was brought up on the St. Joe River, but out of respect for the gentleman from Indiana, I will not talk about that river which is formed by three rivers which join at Three Rivers, Mich., then runs down into and out of Indiana back into Michigan and into Lake Michigan at St. Joe and Benton Harbor. I will go to a moment's comment about the Kalamazoo River on where I now live when I am home. Fifty years ago that was a clear-running stream. There was an abundant supply of food fish, bass, pickerel, pan fish, and in the spring sturgeon and lake trout. We would go up or down the river on picnics, or fishing or hunting trips, and you could drink the water from the river without any fear of becoming ill. But today you can almost walk on the water. It looks like a piece of slate. What is the State

of Michigan thinking of when it permits that kind of condition to grow up? The conservation department has permitted the Kalamazoo, which is a clear-water stream, to become a stinking sewer.

My own little town of Allegan issued bonds, put in a sewage plant, but along the river further up there are towns where they have mills and factories, and they dump their waste and raw sewage into the Kalamazoo River. Many of our cities dump their raw sewage into our rivers, so that on the Kalamazoo the water that comes down to our community, into Allegan County, is not even fit to bathe in. Think of it. A clear, sweet water stream turned into a foul ditch.

The resort business in Michigan is suffering. People come to Michigan, not only because we have that long, long lake shore, the upper peninsula and the lower peninsula, the former with Lake Superior on the north, Lake Michigan on the south, the lower with Huron on the east, Lake Michigan on the west—mile after mile of fresh-water beach. They come, not because of the Great Lakes, but because of our hundreds of inland lakes and streams which, until 15 or 20 years ago, have always been delightful places where one could go, take the family, bathe, catch fish, have a good time in healthful surroundings. What are the rivers now? Open sewage ditches. So I do not propose to vote any Federal money, I say to my good friend from Ann Arbor [Mr. MEADER], until that commission in Michigan gets going on the pollution problem—does something. I know the cities have their factories and that the factories give employment to thousands of people and we do not want to hurt them, but this resort business turns in almost as much money—and remember that money comes from outside our State—the resort business turns in almost as much money to the State of Michigan as does the automobile industry. That is almost unbelievable, but true, nevertheless. Why should any group of sound-thinking, responsible citizens permit the streams of a great community, a great State like ours, noted for its fishing streams, its pure swift-running waters, and beautiful inland lakes—why should they permit those lake sand streams to become unfit for people to use and enjoy? Not long ago when I was home we drove into that part of the city which is on the flats in the valley where the Kalamazoo makes the big horseshoe bend, where is located the business section and many of our finer homes. The stench of that river made it almost impossible for people to sleep down there. It nauseated the people who lived there—who drove through that part of our town. Think of it.

Permit me to repeat. We all realize the industrial communities have a problem on their hands. But it is a problem of their own creating. They can solve it and they have been given time, 35 or 40 years or more. They have no right to dump their waste, their sewage into the rivers, make our streams and some of our lakes unfit for public use.

Permit me to read an editorial from the Allegan Gazette. I read:

#### CITY OF ALLEGAN FIGHTS LONE BATTLE AGAINST KALAMAZOO RIVER POLLUTION

In the current Kalamazoo River pollution dispute, Allegan is like the man, who having paved his street, wants his neighbor to do likewise. For the dust is still flying in his windows.

Allegan is the only municipality down river from Battle Creek, that has met State directives to clean up the stream. It built a sewage disposal plant 10 years ago.

But the river still courses through the city, depositing dead carp on the banks, raising a foul smell on warm days, and ruining the area's chances toward developing a huge resort center.

That's why Allegan, like the man with the paved street, is solidly behind the State water resources board's action against Kalamazoo paper mills, Otsego, and Plainwell to provide disposal facilities.

According to local civic leaders, the city council, junior chamber of commerce, and the conservation league as well as private citizens, designation of the Kalamazoo as an industrial stream would be a knock-out blow to ambitious local dreams.

Allegan built its disposal plant during the depression of the late thirties and it wasn't easily done. Launched in March 1937 the disposal project was a bad dream for some folks until the thing was settled in 1941. In between, engineers struggled with laying sewer lines under what they called the most difficult conditions in the State; labor was a problem, and there was finally a lawsuit over assessment.

The city had gone into action on demands of the State board and also because some far-sighted citizens viewed the newly created Lake Allegan as a future town asset. The city's new hydroelectric plant had created a vast lake, bounded by empty but beautiful stretches of shoreline. Totally undeveloped, there seemed no end to possibilities of a recreational area with Lake Allegan as the arena.

The trend of things to come appeared when plans for a boys' camp failed because Lake Allegan was condemned unfit for swimming or even boating. Pollution had killed all the fish in fact, the picturesque lake was fit only for viewing.

The disposal-plant project was started in January 1938 as a WPA job, and a total estimated cost of \$135,000. The city, which supplied materials, issued \$50,000 in bonds for its share.

The laying of sewer lines required 100 men, and only about 30 were available. But when the work really got under way, there was a time when 500 families were on relief.

When work started, 16 sewers were emptying into the river. To tie these into the plant, lay big interceptor lines, and add the new ones found needed, became a long job. By January 1939 the cost had risen to \$220,000 and in July of that year, the work stopped when funds ran out. The plant was ready, but not operating.

While the WPA upped its share of the program, the city was still shy \$20,000, and some of this was put on a special-assessment roll. It was protested and when it finally was decided in court in March 1941, the assessments were declared void.

Altogether, there were close to 45,000 feet of sewer lines laid and it had taken 352,000 man-hours of work. A total of 24,000 yards of earth-fill was used to raise the lines above river levels and engineers had struggled with old haphazard sewers, deep cuts through hills, and the crooked path of the Kalamazoo to do the job.

With the plant operating and the city's bonds to be paid off in 1958, Allegan officials



are watching their neighbor's actions intently.

Protesting an extension of time for the up-river industries and towns, the city council recently approved a resolution calling for holding the June 1, 1953 pollution abatement date set by the water resources commission.

"The people residing in the valley of the Kalamazoo River have been promised for 30 years that pollution of the river would be eliminated," the resolution reads.

"This pollution is increasing in a large measure until now it has practically destroyed all fish life, made water unsafe for recreational purposes, interfered with irrigation, ruined potential cottage and tourist sites, and otherwise interfered with normal use.

"Allegan got busy 12 years ago and built its plant at about half the cost of today's construction," points out City Manager Philip Beauvais, "And it is self-supporting. Service charges meet the \$10,000 annual operating cost."

But the city's contribution to river cleanliness is but a drop in the bucket to what is needed, he adds. Now it is a matter of waiting to see what happens upstream.

And here is a resolution adopted recently by Outdoor Writers Association of America, Inc. It reads:

#### RESOLUTION 10, WATER POLLUTION

*Resolved*, That the Outdoor Writers Association of America does restate its longstanding firm position favoring water pollution control by agricultural and industrial interests and by all levels of government, employing whatever means or measures required to assure a perpetual abundant supply of wholesome water for all human and animal needs, and makes the following specific additional declarations:

1. We oppose as a matter of principle the proposition that either cities or industries have any right to appropriate unto themselves and defile water, to which no title may be granted and which is a public resource that belongs to all the people.

2. More and more information and knowledge about both polluters and pollution control measures and methods are becoming available from Federal and other sources, and we urge that all members of the Outdoor Writers Association of America, and its friends and cooperating groups, publicize this information and knowledge to the fullest so as to bring the beneficial pressure of public opinion to bear on the offenders.

3. We reject the excuses of "national defense" and "international emergency" and consider them not valid reasons for delay by industrial or governmental polluters in making provision for adequate treatment of waste, and we urge that continuing publicity be given in all cases where defense or emergency are employed for evasion of pollution abatement responsibilities.

4. We urge the extension by Congress of the provisions of Public Law 845 of the Seventy-ninth Congress for a period of 5 years.

5. The Federal Security Agency, of which the United States Public Health Service is a part, is the claimant agency for the seeking of critical materials for waste treatment facilities, and we urge that any serious lacks or shortages known to OWAA members be brought to the attention of the United States Public Health Service, and further that the members assist to the fullest extent through publicity and otherwise the efforts of the United States Public Health Service to guarantee the availability of critical materials for needed treatment facilities.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do not know what sewers in Michigan have to do with the State Department.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just like the State Department, it stinks.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] may I point out that while no funds for the International Claims Commission were included in the 1951 appropriations, there was \$240,000 appropriated in the Deficiency Act, 1950, which was to provide for expenses for a portion of 1950 and the fiscal year 1951. The committee was advised that there was a substantial unobligated balance of these funds on June 30, 1951. The Commission was established by the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, for the purpose of adjudicating the claims of American nationals against the Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia which deposited \$17,000,000 with the United States to cover payment of these claims. The act provides that 3 percent of the claims payments may be covered into the Treasury to offset administrative expenses. The committee reiterates more forcibly than ever that it expects the Commission to carry on and complete its work within the 3-percent allowance and thus at no cost whatever to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, while I have this opportunity and with permission which I expect to obtain from the House after the Committee of the Whole arises today, I include the following letter addressed to me today by Assistant Secretary of State Edward W. Barrett in reply to one of the mimeographed speeches of yesterday:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE,  
Washington, July 25, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROONEY: In fairness to the individuals and the companies concerned, I think the record should be set straight on the use of outside radio commentators, writers, and private corporations in the United States International Information and Educational Exchange Program.

As you well know, it has continually been suggested by many individuals, including Members of both parties in Congress, that this program should utilize as fully as possible the best professional talent obtainable. It has also been emphasized that we should utilize fully services and facilities of private American agencies. In fact, Public Law 402, the basic legislation for this program, calls upon the Secretary of State "to utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, including existing American press, publishing, radio, motion picture, and other agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise. It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country."

Naturally, the Department of State has tried to comply with these very sensible and constructive suggestions and instructions. As one part of this program, we have utilized the part-time services of well-known American radio commentators in reaching our world-wide English-language audience and in reaching audiences in other languages. Such commentators have been extremely generous in doing this work at nominal rates far below the pay scale they normally receive. I hardly need to tell you that it is a gross injustice for anyone to imply that a distinguished American radio commentator could

be swayed to change his views in any respect because he received a nominal fee of \$50 to undertake a special broadcast for the Voice of America. On the contrary, these men deserve very sincere thanks from the Nation for doing this work at fees substantially below those they can command elsewhere.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD W. BARRETT,  
Assistant Secretary.

In connection with another phase of the mimeographed barrage from the Republican side yesterday, I include the following article from yesterday's Washington Daily News:

WEST WON'T REST TILL OATIS FREED, VOICE SAYS

The Voice of America warned Czechoslovakia today that the free world will never rest until Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis is freed.

"No act of Communist injustice directed against an individual," the Voice said, "has aroused the American people to greater indignation than the railroading to a Czechoslovak prison of the American newspaper correspondent \* \* \*."

"No one who loves truth, justice, and freedom will rest easy until this victim of Communist oppression is set free \* \* \*."

"If the Communist jailers of Mr. Oatis had any notion that by placing him in prison and keeping him cut off from friends and countrymen, they would, in time, erase his memory from the minds of free men outside the iron curtain, they are due for a disappointment. Every day that Mr. Oatis remains in prison, he will serve as a reminder of Communist tyranny."

I include also an article from today's Washington Evening Star:

VOICE TELLS OF PERILOUS LIFE IN RUSSIA'S URANIUM MINES—MANY SLAVES FALL TO DEATH CLIMBING DOWN SLICK LADDERS, BROADCAST REPORTS

(By Edward E. Bomar)

Men in Russia's slave labor uranium mines must clamber nearly 500 feet down wooden ladders so slick many fall to their death, the State Department radio reported today.

The Voice of America was broadcasting what it called an eye-witness account of life in a uranium mine in Russian-ruled East Germany. The account said high-grade ore is so precious it is flown to Leningrad for Russia's atomic production program. But working methods were described as so antiquated that ore comes from the mines in sacks, buckets, and even knapsacks.

Other first-hand sources, the Voice said, told of pit disasters due to lack of safety precautions, miserable working conditions and even sabotage.

The latest mine mishap was reported recently from the uranium mining area outside of Zwickau, near the East German-Czechoslovak border, with 9 workmen reported killed and 15 others injured.

Quoting an unidentified worker who finally managed to escape to the west, the Voice gave this picture of life in a mine in the Frohnau region:

"The pits where we worked are about 150 meters (490 feet) deep. We went down into these shafts on wooden ladders, each one about 8 meters (26 feet) high. Each ladder connects to the shaft below. These ladders cause many fatal accidents because they get wet and slippery. During the winter the ladders get icy. This means more accidents."

"Last year about 80 miners were killed in my mine from falling. A lot more were killed when underground shafts fell in on them."

"The uranium ore is brought to the surface in buckets, in ordinary sacks, and in



knapsacks. The quota of each brigade (10 men) for each shift is from 5 to 8 buckets of ore, with each bucket weighing about 100 pounds.

"If they use sacks, they must bring up 15 to 20 sacks. Each sack weighs between 20 and 30 pounds. The knapsack carriers must bring up from 25 to 30 knapsacks of approximately 50 pounds each.

"The ore is packed in wooden boxes marked 'mining-machine parts.'

"Ore shipments go to Freiberg, northeast of Chemnitz, where they are graded by Soviet experts. Especially good ore is flown to Leningrad. At least 25 ore-filled boxcars go from Frohnau to Freiberg each day. They are moved only at night."

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we pass the reading of the paragraph on International Information and Educational Activities until tomorrow, when it shall be the first order of business; that we continue reading the rest of the bill for amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. ROONEY. I understand some sort of agreement was entered into.

Mr. STEFAN. I have not been consulted about it; my colleagues on the minority do not approve of it.

Mr. ROONEY. Will the gentleman inform me whether or not there was such an understanding with the majority leader? I am merely trying to follow instructions, and I understand it was agreed to.

Mr. STEFAN. I know the gentleman is, but I have not been consulted. I consulted my colleagues on the subcommittee, and they do not know anything about it. We want to proceed in an orderly fashion, and read the bill as it is printed in order that the membership may know where we are. If we skip a section and then go back to it later, it is very confusing.

Mr. ROONEY. There may be something to what the gentleman from Nebraska says, but will he clarify the situation by stating whether or not there was such an understanding reached between the leadership on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. STEFAN. I asked the minority floor leader and he suggested that we proceed in an orderly manner.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out international information and educational activities as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U. S. C. 1431-1479) and the act of August 9, 1949 (22 U. S. C. 501), and to administer the programs authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b)), the act of August 24, 1949 (20 U. S. C. 222-224), and the act of September 29, 1950 (Public

Law 861), including employment, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of (1) persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed \$120,000), (2) aliens within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General); travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States and dependents to and from the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed \$8,000); entertainment within the United States (not to exceed \$5,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of space in foreign language publications abroad, without regard to the provisions of law set forth in 44 U. S. C. 322; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries, on land acquired by gift or lease, and construction of necessary buildings thereon; radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration, script writing, translation, and engineering services, by contract or otherwise; and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; \$85,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 may be used for representation abroad: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is authorized in making contracts for the use of the international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of leasehold interests payments may be made in advance for the entire term, or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of motion-picture films.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVINGER: Page 15, line 3, strike out "\$85,000,000" and insert "\$70,000,000."

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CLEVINGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think it would be wise to let the debate go a short time without limitation; then subsequently if it develops it is going too long a restriction may be imposed.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make this request for the reason that we have now spent 2 days discussing practically nothing but this very item.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to the Voice of America section, and I should like 5 minutes on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I renew the request I made a while ago, previous to recognition of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER] that we pass the item "International information and educational activities" until tomorrow, when it will be the first order of business, and proceed to read the remainder of the bill beginning at page 16.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, I find it extremely odd, even perplexing, to note the similarities in the criticisms of the Voice of America made by some of my esteemed colleagues and those made by the Communists.

For instance, permit me to direct attention to the following quotation:

The Voice of America is equally not the voice of the American people, but the voice of those who would like to drag the world into a new war.

Is this a charge being made here by those opposed to the present appropriation? No; it is a charge made on the Czechoslovak national radio on April 14 of this year.

I have heard it said here on the floor that the people of the world do not like the Voice. So say the Reds. The Moscow radio on April 2 said, and I quote:

The great masses throughout the world do not care for the Voice of America. This Voice of Wall Street is the enemy of mankind. Its sweet words are trying to entice the peoples of the world into a third world war.

A few of those who are against this program say that its news is slanted and



not honest. So does Moscow. I quote from a Moscow-originating Greek broadcast of April 3:

One of our women listeners writes from Athens that no honest Greek can listen to the Athens radio, which repeats the filthy lies and slanders of the Voice of America.

We hear from some that the program is wasting money. We hear the same criticism from the Communists. The Bulgarian radio, on March 12, said that—

Truman is attempting to waste hundreds of millions of dollars in order to make the lies of the Voice of America more clever.

The Voice, according to its critics here, is ineffective. That is exactly what the Polish radio said when quoting from a letter allegedly written by a Miss Kurzynski, a member of the Union of Polish Youth in Warsaw. The young lady is supposed to have written, and I quote from the broadcast of March 1:

I have listened a few times to the Voice of America, and I have come to the conclusion that they must be very naive to think that they can convince us with their propaganda.

But the Polish radio then went on, unwittingly, to give a clue to the real effectiveness of the truth told by the Voice—something to which its domestic opponents seem to close their eyes. The Polish broadcast continued:

When I thought about it afterward I got even more furious with those who believed this rubbish. The people who work on the Voice of America lie because they get paid for it, and various fools in our country listen, believe, and repeat, even though they live in our midst, work with us, and see what things are really like.

Let me read you two more statements, and ask that you guess who said them—the opponents of the Voice of America here or its equally determined opponents in Communist countries. The first of these quotes says:

The broadcasts of the Voice of America are proving, however, that the words of Mr. Truman are vain words, because the picture of life in the United States as presented by the Voice of America is neither complete nor true.

And now the second quotation:

It is obvious that the basic principles of American radio propaganda are not to give objective reportage but to pervert facts; not to speak the truth but to manufacture lies. This is not unusual because the Voice of America is affiliated with the United States State Department. In other words, it renders services for the Truman-Acheson over-all foreign policy.

Although statements similar to these have been made here in the United States and even by certain Congressmen, these are not their quotes. The first was from the February 9 broadcast of the Rumanian radio and the second from a Moscow broadcast to the Far East made on February 10.

And a last quote which some you may recognize immediately as having a familiar sound:

As the name of the Voice of America implies, it is America which is supposed to give its opinions here on world problems, big and small, as well as to tell its own story. However, it is not Americans who voice opinions on big and small problems, but only the employees of the State Department.

No, this statement was not made in the Halls of Congress, although many similar ones have been. This one was made in the newspaper of the East German Soviet-controlled Liberal Democratic Party on November 18, 1950.

As I said earlier, I find it most perplexing to find charges being repeated here which are identical with those being made by the Communists the world over. I am not questioning the loyalty, sincerity, or good faith of those who unwittingly repeat Communist charges against the Voice, but I suggest they are permitting themselves to unintentionally play the game of the Kremlin. Moscow's expenditures for jamming the broadcasts of the Voice of America are conclusive proof of its effectiveness, proof that truth is anathema to the Communists, proof that we should increase the facilities and broadcasts of the Voice.

(Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely believe that there is nobody in the United States more devoted to the welfare of our country and more determined to take the measures necessary to combat the menace of communism than the Congress. Consequently, I find it puzzling to figure out why there are some among us who appear anxious to do exactly what the Kremlin and its stooges want done. This move to cut back the appropriations for the campaign of truth and its Voice of America is precisely what Stalin would want us to do. Since I know full well the unswerving patriotism and loyalty of those who are supporting this move, I am convinced that it can come only from ignorance of how desperately the Communist masters want to keep their people from hearing the information put out by the Voice of America.

On March 22 of this year the Red China radio said to the Chinese people, and I quote:

Following the repulsion of imperialist military, political, and economic aggression in China, the victorious Chinese people should boycott the Voice of America, the important weapon of American imperialist aggression. Every peace-loving and patriotic Chinese should vountarily stop listening to the Voice of America, so that its insults, threats, and frauds can have no effect on us. \* \* \* We request the Government to outlaw listening to the Voice of America for undermining national and people's interests and provoking a world war, which are against the principles of the common program. The Chinese people should be ashamed of listening to the Voice of America.

If this move to seriously cut the Voice succeeds, it will be unnecessary for the Chinese Reds to outlaw listening to the Voice; it will be unnecessary for them to insist that the people boycott the Voice and refuse to listen to it. The action of those of you who support this reduction will have done the work of the Communists for them, and they will be unable to hear the Voice, which will again be reduced to a whisper.

It is not only the Chinese Reds who want us to cut this program severely. It is all other Communists. Listen to

what President Gottwald, of Red Czechoslovakia, had to say on March 25:

It is all the more our duty to warn all those who, rather than listen to the voice of their hearts, listen to the Voice of America. \* \* \* Our national security corps will know what to do with people of this type, and it can count on the full understanding and support of our public opinion.

Since the Commies in Czechoslovakia are afraid to allow their people to listen to the Voice, how can this proposed cut—which will make it more difficult for the Czechs to hear our programs—serve anybody's interests except those of the Reds?

Let me read you gentlemen one more quotation from a Russian official. This one is from a speech by Rotschin, the Soviet delegate to the Third Committee of the UN's Fifth General Assembly and was made on November 17 of last year during the debate on a proposal to condemn radio jamming. Rotschin said:

In the face of the so-called psychological warfare being carried out by Washington and London against a number of nations, the right and duty of the latter is to take steps in order to paralyze the aggressor in this war, to defend their people from the consequences of such an attack, and to render the aggressor's weapons ineffective.

It is unquestionably necessary from the Communist point of view to keep the truth from reaching their people—for nothing threatens their criminal tyranny more than the truth. Lack of adequate funds will stifle the campaign of truth much more completely than any amount of Russian jamming. In fact, it will make that jamming unnecessary. So cutting the size of this program will in no way serve the interests of the American people. On the contrary, it will do for Stalin a service which he could not in his wildest dreams have imagined he could get us to do for him.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. ROONEY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

##### LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION *Salaries and expenses, general administration*

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice and for examination of judicial offices, including purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his Administrative Assistant; special attorneys and special assistants to the Attorney General; and examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; \$2,250,000.

#### FEDERAL YOUTH CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to what I think has been one of the most significant and farseeing pieces of legislation dealing with young offenders to be put on the Federal statute books in many years.

I have long urged that the courts find a more intelligent and constructive way



of handling young men and women who come in conflict with the law. So many of these are the unfortunate victims of broken homes, or are so handicapped mentally or physically, so psychopathic or maladjusted that they cannot be handled by traditional methods and punitive treatment alone. Society has long been seeking a better method, and some years ago a distinguished committee of Federal judges presided over by Chief Judges John J. Parker, Learned Hand, and Orie Phillips adapted a program originally sponsored by the American Law Institute to the Federal system. Following extended hearings and long considerations by the Congress, the President last September approved the Federal Youth Corrections Act. This act will shortly become effective.

The act applies to persons under the age of 22 who have committed Federal offenses and places a completely new tool in the hands of the judges. They may, of course, continue to place more hopeful offenders on probation and they still may sentence under the provisions of adult laws. But there are three important new provisions: First, the court may commit to the Youth Board a young offender for treatment for an indefinite period up to 6 years; or, Second, if the court believes the youth requires treatment or supervision—that is a sex offender—for a period of more than 6 years it may commit him for an indefinite period not to exceed the maximum penalty provided for the offense; and, third, if the court is uncertain as to how he should proceed he may place the youth in the custody of the Attorney General for study, diagnosis, and recommendation prior to the imposition of sentence.

When a youth is sentenced under one of the new provisions, he will be placed in a classification center where he will be studied intensively by a group of trained specialists. Their reports will be forwarded to the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, who will recommend to the newly created Youth Correction Division of the Board of Parole a program of treatment for the consideration of the Division. The Board, in cooperation with the Director, will determine the institutional program. Reports and recommendations of the Bureau of Prisons will be submitted periodically to the Youth Division for their consideration and action. The Board will determine whether further institutional treatment is necessary and under what conditions he may be released. The conditional release of all youth offenders and their unconditional discharge rests exclusively with the Division.

Every youth will be returned to his home or some place selected for him on conditional release at least two years before the end of his commitment period. Thus, continuing help will be provided in applying the training and education which he has received. The responsibility for providing the necessary guidance after the youth returns home will not rest with professionally trained workers alone. The Act makes provision for enlisting volunteer sponsors—intelligent, stable, well-adjusted private citizens—

who can thus share in reclaiming young lives. This is a significant provision because it recognizes that the community must accept some responsibility for the problems of its young people. Also, it recognizes that many private citizens are equipped to make real contributions to the lives of youngsters who have previously been deprived of the counsel and help of parents or capable adults.

A final provision of the Act looks beyond the problem of youth and crime and focuses attention on the fact that adequate care of youth offenders is but one segment, though a tremendously important one, of the vexing problem of crime. Recognizing this, the Act creates an Advisory Corrections Council comprised of United States Judges and Administrative Officers who will meet to study the prevention of crime and the treatment and correction of all offenders. The Committee will also make recommendations to Congress for the improvement of the administration of criminal justice and bring about closer relations between the courts, the prisons and the law enforcement agencies.

Now, let me illustrate just how this act will work in actual practice. Bob was a completely irresponsible 20-year-old youngster. Enormously egotistical, lacking in respect for authority, maladjusted sexually, he began having difficulties in early childhood. Teachers found it virtually impossible to maintain order when he was in their classes. He was 14 when he was first committed to a training school for car theft. Within a few months he was back in the community where he was involved in a continual series of burglaries, robberies, and sex offenses, which were interrupted briefly by periods in juvenile institutions and jails. Because of his behavior his parents refused to permit him to return home, although they continued to provide him with money and clothing. When he finally came to Federal court, after stealing a series of cars and driving them across State lines, he received another sentence of a few months. Studies by psychiatrists and psychologists and other professional people held out some hope for reclaiming the young man if there were sufficient time for treatment. However, almost before Bob's problems could be properly understood by the staff, he was on his way back to the street. He resumed his predatory activities and now is back in prison for a long term.

Had Bob been committed as a youth offender there would have been adequate time to study him and plan a program for him which might have held greater promise of his eventual adjustment in the community.

The case of Joe was a bit more spectacular, perhaps, and also presented problems which were almost without solution under the traditional method of sentencing. Joe's name flashed briefly in the headlines when at 22 he staged an armed postal robbery in Chicago. By any standards, he was a pretty good youngster. The oldest of seven children, he had gone to work after finishing high school to assist in supporting the fam-

ily. His father was in poor health and was chronically unemployed. Financial pressures in the home mounted. Finally, Joe, who had never before been in trouble, got a gun and tried a direct approach to financial security. The law is inflexible in cases of this sort. The result, a mandatory sentence of 25 years—Joe is still in the penitentiary. He must serve 8½ years before he may apply for parole. He is doing pretty well in the institution, but whether when he has finally squared his debt to society he will still be a decent person with a healthy respect for law and order is a matter for conjecture.

Then there are cases of young men who have some physical handicap, such as a harelip or a clubfoot or some other deformity which can be cured at little expense to the Federal Government and their handicaps to normal community adjustment removed. Under the new law that is feasible.

I have long been hopeful that some method would be found for dealing with sexual psychopath. It is futile to try to scare these maladjusted persons into compliance with the law. They simply are unable to understand and appreciate the consequences of their actions. Some other method must be found. Under the new Youth Act, the judges can commit such individuals to the new Board for an indefinite term up to the maximum specified by statute, which is always long enough. The Board can then see that they are given necessary psychiatric treatment until they are safe to release in the community, and, most importantly, they can put them under close supervision when released and whenever there is any evidence that they have relapsed they can be returned to the institution and given further treatment. Let me give you a specific case that was called to my attention. It concerned a boy who exposed himself on a military reservation. He came from a good family and there was no other evidence of sex delinquency in his family. After commitment we found he had what is known to the doctors as a hypospadias. This is a malformation of the opening of the urinary channel and it had not been discovered by his family. He had been overcompensating for this handicap by exposing himself. It was found that the condition was operable and he is now recovered and living normally.

These are but a few illustrations of the great promise the new act holds. It is in no sense a softening of treatment because the judge still retains discretion to sentence an offender under the regular procedure or under the Youth Correction Act he can give him a life sentence if he thinks necessary and the Division can commit him to Alcatraz. What it does is to put new tools into the hands of the judges and the Department of Justice.

I will watch the progress under the act with great interest and report to you later.

Under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include an article describing the act written by Chief Judge Orie L. Phillips of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.



**THE FEDERAL YOUTH CORRECTIONS ACT**  
(By Orle L. Phillips, Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit)

Public Law 865, the Federal Youth Corrections Act to provide a system for the treatment and rehabilitation of youth offenders and to improve the administration of criminal justice, was enacted by the Eighty-first Congress and was approved by the President on September 30, 1950.

It was the culmination of an effort of 10 years of the Judicial Conference of the United States and its Committee on Punishment for Crime to secure the enactment of legislation that would provide means and methods of training and treatment of youth offenders not proper subjects for probation, designed to correct and prevent antisocial tendencies and effect rehabilitation and thus create an essential complement to our probation system.

The chairman of the conference committee referred to is Chief Judge John J. Parker. The other members are Chief Judge Learned Hand, Chief Judge Paul J. McCormick, Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws, Chief Judge Carroll C. Hincks, Circuit Judge John C. Collet, and the writer. Judge Hincks, Judge Collet, and myself were constituted as a subcommittee to study and report on the treatment of youth offenders. It has been my privilege to serve as chairman of that subcommittee. Judge Laws was designated as chairman of a committee to study and report on sentencing of adult offenders. However, Judge Laws met frequently with my subcommittee and rendered service of great value in drafting and securing the passage of Public Law 865.

#### THE YOUTHFUL OFFENDER

In an address before the Federal Bar Association at Washington, D. C., September 27, 1947, on the subject *The Treatment of Youth Offenders*, I said:

"Reliable statistics demonstrate, beyond possible doubt, that the period in life between 16 and 23 years of age is a focal source of crime. It is during that period that habitual criminals are spawned.

"The 1947 Crime Report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation discloses these facts: Persons 16 to 21, inclusive, constitute 15.2 percent of our population above the age of 15 (based on 1940 census figures), but they are responsible for approximately 36 percent of our robberies; they constitute 42 percent of our apprehended burglars; and 53 percent of our automobile thieves.<sup>1</sup> Boys from 17 to 21, inclusive, are arrested for major crimes (homicide, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny-theft, auto theft, and rape) in greater numbers than persons of any other 5-year age group. They are arrested for serious crimes three times as often as adults from 35 to 39; four times as often as those 40 to 44; and six times as often as those 45 to 49.<sup>2</sup>

"Twenty-one-year-olds offend more frequently than persons of any other age; 20-year olds come next; and then 19-year olds.<sup>3</sup>

"Sociologists and psychiatrists tell us that special causations, which occur in the period between adolescence and manhood, are, in a large measure, responsible for antisocial conduct trends manifest by persons in that

age group. Embraced in these causes are unusually rapid growth in the framework of the body, the stature, and particularly in the size of the organs; discrepancies in the relative increase in the size and functioning of different parts of the body, physiological alterations that take place in that period of life, sometimes poorly balanced one with another; and the heightened activity of the glands of internal secretion not infrequently accompanied with lack of balance in their functioning. These causes, they tell us, result in a feeling of restlessness and impulsiveness, and confusion of ideas and emotions. With increase of physical vigor and urge to action, there is a release of feelings of aggressiveness and decrease of feelings of fear. There come a real pleasure in adventure, in recklessness, and even in violent deed. While the induction of boys into crime gangs is a well-known phenomenon in response to social pressures, it not infrequently is the response to an inner urge to reckless activity in combination with the acceptance of a boyish notion of what constitutes definite proof of virility.

"In addition to the ideas and impulses and the surcharged emotions of youth that tend to bring about antisocial conduct, social situations peculiar to the period between childhood and adult life also are a contributing factor. Most youths are released from school at about 16. Old companionships are broken and the boy finds himself more or less adrift and free to associate with casual acquaintances, or perchance with older fellows whose behavior tendencies are unsettled. This results in groups of restive and dissatisfied youths who have a common tendency to seize upon criminality as a solution for disturbing uncertainties. One further basic cause exists. Sixteen to twenty-one is the period of greatest vocational maladjustment. The youth is of working age. Not infrequently his vocational training in school cannot be utilized in finding a job. This adds to the natural instability of that period of life—definite economic and vocational uncertainties. This tends to build up in the individual an attitude of cynicism concerning honesty and whether it pays.

"Again, reliable statistics demonstrate, with reasonable certainty, that existing methods of treatment of criminally inclined youths are not solving the problem. A large percentage of those released from our reformatories and penal institutions return to antisocial conduct and ultimately become hardened criminals. Indeed, I sometimes wonder whether our penal institutions, because of their environment and the lack of segregation between classes and ages of criminals, do not foster, rather than prevent, crime. By herding youth with maturity, the novice with the sophisticate, the impressionable with the hardened; and by subjecting the youth offenders to the evil influence of older criminals and their teaching of criminal techniques without the inhibitions that come from normal contacts and counteracting prophylaxis, many of our penal institutions actively spread the infection of crime and foster, rather than check, the plague. The thought is suggested in the lines of Ogden Nash—

"He who has never tasted jail  
Lives well within the legal pale;  
While he who's served a heavy sentence,  
Renews the racket, not repentance."

"I am not unmindful that rapid strides have been made in recent years toward a more scientific treatment of offenders under the Federal system. New institutions make possible some classification and segregation of classes. Many offenders of a type suitable to be placed under supervised probation are being rehabilitated by the effective work of probation officers. Nevertheless, I am convinced that the system is, in many respects,

defective with respect both to personnel and facilities for the handling of youth offenders.

"Most of the causes which contribute to antisocial conduct to which I have referred disappear when the youth reaches full maturity. Our problem is to provide a successful method and means for treatment of young men between the ages of 16 and 23 who stand convicted in our Federal courts and are not fit subjects for supervised probation; a method and means that will effect rehabilitation and restore normality rather than develop recidivists.

"An idea for a new plan for correctional treatment of youth offenders emerged from the work of the delinquency committee of the Boys' Bureau of the Community Service Society in New York. Early in 1938, it made public a report on youth offenders and the criminal justice system. The report was published by the MacMillan Co. under the title "Youth in the Toils." Shortly after the publication, the American Law Institute examined the report and its recommendations for new methods of dealing with youth offenders, and after 2 years of study, formulated a model act for establishing a youth correction authority. As a matter of the Council of the American Law Institute, I had an opportunity to know something about the study and to have some small part in the drafting of the model act.

"After an intensive study of the subject, the Judicial Conference Committee made a comprehensive report and submitted an act for the treatment of youth offenders, patterned on the model act. The Judicial Conference approved the report and the proposed act."

#### THE ACT AND ITS PROVISIONS

The draft bill was introduced in the Eightieth Congress by Senator HARLEY M. KILGORE, S. 857, and in the House by Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER, H. R. 1860. It was reintroduced in the Senate and House by Senator KILGORE and Congressman WALTER in the Eighty-first Congress and was passed by both Houses. Much credit is due to Senator PAT McCARRAN, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator KILGORE, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee to which the matter was referred, Congressman WALTER, and Congressman SAM HOBBS in bringing about the passage of the bill.

Eight-member Parole Board: The act abolishes the present Parole Board and creates in the Department of Justice a new Board of Parole to consist of 8 members, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It provides for staggered terms for the members of the Board of Parole. It creates within the Board of Parole a Youth Correction Division, and provides that the Attorney General shall from time to time designate members of the Board of Parole to serve on such Division as the work requires, and that the Attorney General shall from time to time designate one of the members of the Division to serve as chairman and delegate to him such administrative duties and responsibilities as may be required to carry out the purposes of the act.

Rehabilitation rather than punishment: The underlying theory of the act is to substitute for retributive punishment methods of training and treatment designed to correct and prevent antisocial tendencies. It departs from the mere punitive idea of dealing with criminals and looks primarily to the objective idea of rehabilitation. It defines a youth offender as a person under the age of 22 years at the time of conviction. It defines treatment as corrective and preventative guidance and training, designed to protect the public by correcting the antisocial tendencies of youth offenders.

<sup>4</sup>The Judicial Conference of the United States.

<sup>1</sup>The percentages for 1949 are as follows: 34 percent for robbery; 40.5 percent for burglary; and 47 percent for auto theft.

<sup>2</sup>The figures for 1949 show that persons 17 to 21, inclusive, were arrested for serious crimes 2.3 times as often as adults 30 to 34; 3 times as often as those 35 to 39; 4.3 times as often as those 40 to 44; and 6.2 times as often as those 45 to 49.

<sup>3</sup>These 1947 figures are based on frequency of arrests in age groups 16 to 21, inclusive. The corresponding figures for 1949 show the same order.



Powers of the court: Under its provisions, if the court finds that a youth offender does not need treatment, it may suspend the imposition or execution of sentence and place the youth offender on probation. Thus, the power of the court to grant probation is left undisturbed by the act. If the court finds that a convicted person is a youth offender and the offense is punishable by imprisonment it may, as a penalty for the offense and in lieu of the penalty otherwise provided by law, sentence the youth offender to the custody of the Attorney General for treatment and supervision until discharged by the Division, as provided in the act.

If the court finds that the youth offender will not derive benefit from the treatment and should not be committed to the Division, it may sentence the youth offender under any other applicable penalty provision. Thus, it will be seen that the court in its discretion may, in the case of a youth offender, either grant probation, commit him to the Division, or sentence him under other applicable law.

The act also provides in section 5010 (e) that "If the court desires additional information as to whether a youth offender will derive benefit from treatment under subsections (b) or (c) it may order that he be committed to the custody of the Attorney General for observation and study at an appropriate classification center or agency. Within 60 days from the date of the order, or such additional period as the court may grant, the Division shall report to the court its findings."

Classification studies and reports: If the youth offender is committed to the Division, he will be sent first to a classification center where a classification agency set up by the Director of the Bureau of Prisons will make a complete study of the youth offender, including a mental and physical examination to ascertain his personal traits, his capacities, pertinent circumstances of his school, family life, any previous delinquency or criminal experience, and any mental or physical defect or other factor contributing to his delinquency. In the absence of exceptional circumstances, this study will be completed within 30 days. The classification agency will then forward to the Director and the Division a report of its findings with respect to the youth offender and its recommendations as to his treatment. On receipt of such report and recommendations from the classification agency the Director may—

"(1) Recommend to the Division that the committed youth offender be released conditionally under supervision; or

"(2) Allocate and direct the transfer of the committed youth offender to an agency or institution for treatment; or

"(3) Order the committed youth offender confined and afforded treatment under such conditions as he believes best designed for the protection of the public.

"(b) The Director may transfer at any time a committed youth offender from one agency or institution to any other agency or institution."

The act provides that—

"The Director shall from time to time designate, set aside, and adapt institutions and agencies under the control of the Department of Justice for treatment. Insofar as practical, such institutions and agencies shall be used only for treatment of committed youth offenders, and such youth offenders shall be segregated from other offenders, and classes of committed youth offenders shall be segregated according to their needs for treatment.

"No youth offender shall be committed to the Attorney General under this chapter until the Director shall certify that proper and adequate treatment facilities and personnel have been provided."

The act further provides that—

"The Director shall cause periodic examinations and reexaminations to be made of all committed youth offenders and shall report to the Division as to each such offender as the Division may require. United States probation officers and supervisory agents shall likewise report to the Division respecting youth offenders under their supervision as the Division may direct."

Procedures following classification: The act further provides:

"(a) The Division may at any time after reasonable notice to the Director release conditionally under supervision a committed youth offender. When, in the judgment of the Director, a committed youth offender should be released conditionally under supervision he shall so report and recommend to the Division.

"(b) The Division may discharge a committed youth offender unconditionally at the expiration of 1 year from the date of conditional release."

Section 5010 (b) of the act provides:

"If the court shall find that a convicted person is a youth offender, and the offense is punishable by imprisonment under applicable provisions of law other than this subsection, the court may, in lieu of the penalty of imprisonment otherwise provided by law, sentence the youth offender to the custody of the Attorney General for treatment and supervision pursuant to this chapter until discharged by the Division as provided in section 5017 (c) of this chapter."

Section 5010 (c) of the act provides:

"If the court shall find that the youth offender may not be able to derive maximum benefit from treatment by the Division prior to the expiration of 6 years from the date of conviction it may, in lieu of the penalty of imprisonment otherwise provided by law, sentence the youth offender to the custody of the Attorney General for treatment and supervision pursuant to this chapter for any further period that may be authorized by law for the offense or offenses of which he stands convicted or until discharged by the Division as provided in section 5017 (d) of this chapter."

Section 5017 (c) provides:

"A youth offender committed under section 5010 (b) of this chapter shall be released conditionally under supervision on or before the expiration of 4 years from the date of his conviction and shall be discharged unconditionally on or before 6 years from the date of his conviction."

Section 5017 (d) provides:

"A youth offender committed under section 5010 (c) of this chapter shall be released conditionally under supervision not later than 2 years before the expiration of the term imposed by the court. He may be discharged unconditionally at the expiration of not less than 1 year from the date of his conditional release. He shall be discharged unconditionally on or before the expiration of the maximum sentence imposed, computed uninterruptedly from the date of conviction."

Youth offenders permitted to remain at liberty under supervision or conditionally released are to be under the supervision of United States probation officers, supervisory agents appointed by the Attorney General, and voluntary supervisory agents approved by the Division. The Division is authorized to encourage the formation of voluntary organizations composed of members who will serve without compensation as voluntary supervisory agents and sponsors. The powers and duties of voluntary supervisory agents and sponsors shall be limited and defined by regulations adopted by the Division.

The Division may revoke or modify any of its previous orders respecting committed youth offenders, except an order of unconditional release.

Charts I and II, which are set forth on pages 16 and 17 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Eighty-first Congress, more graphically indicate the administrative personnel and the duties and functions thereof under the act.

The most important features of the plan are integration of correctional measures under a single body, segregation of youth offenders from adult offenders, and segregation of classes of youth offenders, power to develop variety of treatment facilities, flexibility of operations in adapting particular forms of treatment to individual youths in accordance with their favorable or unfavorable responses, adequate supervision during conditional release, and focusing of effort on the important youth crime problem.

#### EXPERIENCE IN ENGLAND—THE BORSTAL SYSTEM

The natural inquiry is, Will the plan work? That it will, I think, has been demonstrated by the experience under the Borstal system in England.

A report of a department committee on prisons appointed by the Home Secretary in 1894 to inquire into the administration of the English prisons found, among other things, that an extremely large number of youths between the ages of 16 and 21 passed through the prisons every year; that under the existing system numbers of these young prisoners came out of prison in a condition as bad or worse than when they went in, and that the age when the majority of habitual criminals are made lies between 16 and 21. As a result, an experiment was begun in a wing of Bedford Prison. Younger lads were segregated from the men and a special program of trade instruction, drill, and a scheme of rewards and encouragements to industry and good conduct was introduced. A wing of the prison at Borstal was next set aside for the special handling of offenders between 16 and 23. By the end of 1903, the entire institution at Borstal was devoted to an intensive program for this age group, of hard work and strict discipline, tempered by contrivances of reward, encouragement, and hope. From this experimental beginning has developed what is known as the Borstal system in England. It now embraces 13 institutions. Some are walled. Others are completely open. Each institution has its own particular specialty. One provides complete facilities for trade training in metal and woodwork. Another is laid out and run as a summer camp with work and recreational programs which keep the boys out-of-doors. A third is largely devoted to agriculture and stock raising. One institution graduates skilled workers in the building trades.

The Borstal program: While the institutions differ in many respects, they have certain things in common. These are first, a full 16-hour day of arduous, active work and recreation, leaving no time for brooding or self-pity; second, an individual plan based on close acquaintance with individual needs and antecedents and calculated to return the young men to society as social and rehabilitated citizens; and, third, a high degree of personal interest on the part of the staff, particularly the housemaster, whose chief job is individual guidance.

The Borstal method of rehabilitation relies on the physical, physiological, and social characteristics of youth which distinguish them from both children and adults. It is predicated on the concept that criminal youth require special treatment because of the number and kind of offenses they commit, the causation factors underlying their conduct, and the prospect they hold out for success through correctional treatment.

Three cardinal principles dominate the system: (1) flexibility, (2) individualization, and (3) emphasis on the intangibles. Flexi-



bility means that a premium is placed on experimentation and originality. Individualization is facilitated by careful study at an observation center to which all lads sentenced to Borstal detention are sent and by allocating each youth to the particular Borstal that is best fitted to meet his peculiar problems. The quality of the personnel is perhaps the most important of the intangibles. The system has attracted a capable and devoted personnel.

Life in the institution: Generally, persons between the ages of 16 and 23 may be sentenced to Borstal training. After commitment, the youth is sent directly to a classification center where he spends a minimum of 30 days before he is allocated. During the time he is under observation, a detailed study of his social and family background is made and he receives a physical and mental examination. The allocating board then sends him to an institution of maximum, medium, or minimum security.

During his stay in the institution to which he is allocated, the Borstal boy is not cut off from life in the outside world. He may receive frequent visits from relatives and friends. Little limit is set upon the number of letters he may send or receive. Once a week he goes on a route march, or informal hike, outside of the institution. For 1 or 2 weeks each summer he may camp with his group under the control of a housemaster in a completely free and unfenced spot in the country. If he is at one of the open institutions, he may go alone or in a group to moving pictures and to classes in the town. In some instances, he is allowed to go home once during his period of treatment to see his family, or to arrange for a job after his release. Escapes are infrequent. During the year 1937, which is typical, only 4 percent of the entire population of the Borstal institutions escaped or attempted to escape.

At one of the open institutions, 600 boys were received during an 18-month period, of whom only 30 were transferred back to a walled institution. Ninety-five percent were found adapted to the open institution. During that period, with no walls, no bars, no locks, only six men absconded. Of these six, not one committed any offense while at large.

Parole: A Borstal boy is subject to release after he has served 6 months. He is released on parole. The parole period extends for 1 year beyond the unserved term of commitment. There is a parole organization for the Borstal institutions, known as the Borstal Association, a semiofficial body established in 1904. It receives the largest proportion of its funds from the Government. A small portion comes from publicly solicited donations. The director of the association had served for 7 years as a governor of a Borstal institution and 8 years before as a housemaster. There is a close connection between the parole organization and the institution from which the boy is to be released. After a boy has been allocated, and before he is transported to the institution, he has an opportunity to discuss his future with the Borstal Association director. The conditions of his parole are explained to him before he has commenced his period of institutional training. He is given a Borstal Association number. A representative of the Borstal Association visits each institution once a month and any boy may see him by simply asking the housemaster to make an appointment. Before his release, the boy again receives a visit from the Borstal associate and at this time definite plans are made for his return to the community under supervision. The Borstal Association gives the parolee the name of the Borstal associate who will be responsible for him and again explains to him the conditions of his parole. During the period of parole, the boy is under the indi-

vidual attention and supervision of the Borstal associate. The association has both paid and voluntary parole officers who stand in an informal and friendly relationship to the boy and assist him in readjusting himself to civilian life. Boys who have no fit home to return to, or who are homeless, are a first charge upon the association. Lodgings are provided for them before they are released and funds are forthcoming for board and room until they are placed in work. Parolees are given tools, clothing, tuition for special classes, and other necessities with the understanding that the association is to be repaid after the boy has started to earn. This kind of carefully individualized parole attention which follows the boy after his release from the institution parallels the treatment received in the institution from the housemaster.

This gives you a rough idea of the Borstal institution and parole system. Much more detailed information may be found in the book, *Criminal Youth and the Borstal System*, published in 1941 by the Commonwealth Fund; in the article the English Borstal System of Parole and After Care, by Benedict S. Alper, published in the October-December 1941 issue of *Federal Probation*, and in an article the English Borstal System After the War, by Molly Mellanby, assistant director, His Majesty's Prison Commission, and R. L. Bradley, director of Borstal administration, published in the December 1948 issue of *Federal Probation*.

Accomplishments of the Borstal program: Now as to the results, I regret that comprehensive statistics, since the Prison Commission Report for the year 1936, are not available. That report shows that on February 1, 1936, 13294 had graduated from Borstal training and that out of the total English male prison population of 8,464, only 688, or 8.1 percent, of ex-Borstal lads were serving sentences of imprisonment, penal servitude, or preventative detention. By 1942, over 15,000 men in England, most of them married and owning their own homes, had passed through a Borstal institution. At the end of 1946, there were approximately 3,000 undergoing training in the 13 Borstal institutions. If past experience is a guide, only a relatively small percentage of those, on release, will return to antisocial behavior.

#### SIMILAR ACTIVITIES IN THE STATES

In 1941 California enacted a youth-authority program similar to the model youth-authority correction act formulated by the American Law Institute. The results in California, where the first of these was established, demonstrate that the plan is realistic and practical. More than 10,000 youthful offenders have passed through the California Youth Authority, and of that number less than 25 percent have either failed on parole or committed new offenses after discharge. This is considerably below the 69 percent who, during a 5-year period in the 1930's before the youth authority was established in California, failed on parole or committed new offenses after release from correctional institutions.

It is my considered judgment that if the system provided for under the Federal Youth Corrections Act is wisely and competently administered, as I have every reason to believe it will be, it will result in the greatest improvement in the administration of criminal justice that has occurred in my lifetime.

#### ADVISORY CORRECTIONAL COUNCIL

Finally, the act provides for an advisory correction council, "composed of one United States circuit judge and two United States district judges designated from time to time by the Chief Justice of the United States, of one member, who shall be chairman, designated by the Attorney General, and, ex officio of the Chairman of the Board of Parole, the Chairman of the Youth Division,

the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, and the Chief of Probation of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. The council shall hold stated meetings to consider problems of treatment and correction of all offenders against the United States and shall make such recommendations to the Congress, the President, the Judicial Conference of the United States, and other appropriate officials as may improve the administration of criminal justice and assure the coordination and integration of policies respecting the disposition, treatment, and correction of all persons convicted of offenses against the United States. It shall also consider measures to promote the prevention of crime and delinquency, suggest appropriate studies in this connection to be undertaken by agencies both public and private. The members of the council shall serve without compensation, but necessary travel and subsistence expenses as authorized by law shall be paid from available appropriations of the Department of Justice."

#### BROADER SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ACT

We stand today in a troubled world. The balance between peace and war is so delicate that no one can forecast the future with certainty. I am confident in the faith that we can, if we will, preserve our free institutions and our American way of life, but if America is to be saved, it will be due largely to the courage, the fidelity, the devotion, and the patriotism of American youth. The problem of that unfortunate part of our young men who fall into antisocial tendencies presents an inspiring challenge. It can be solved. Instead of 70 percent of our youth offenders developing into hardened criminals, more than 70 percent can be rehabilitated and made useful members of society. What a saving. In dollars and cents, yes, but, what is more important, a saving of human values and a strengthening of the foundations of our society. The youth of today will be the men and women of tomorrow. To them alone can we pass on our priceless heritages. Shall we do our full part to make more of them worthy successors?

(Mr. TOLLEFSON and Mr. SCUDDER asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks previously made.)

The Clerk read as follows:

#### IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, including advance of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while en route; payment of allowances (at a rate not in excess of \$1 per day) to aliens, while held in custody under the immigration laws, for work performed; payment of rewards for information leading to the apprehension or conviction of violators of the immigration laws; not to exceed \$35,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and accounted for solely on his certificate; not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed 150 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to exceed four for replacement only) and maintenance and operation of aircraft; firearms and ammunition; refunds of head tax, maintenance bills, immigration fines, and other items properly returnable, except deposits of aliens who become public charges and deposits to secure payment of fines and passage money; operation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto; reimbursement of the



General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; and maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies and their wives and dependent children, including return of such persons to place of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be authorized by the Attorney General; \$36,500,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: Page 23, line 17, after the semicolon, strike out the figure "\$36,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$36,400,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska, [Mr. STEFAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Census: For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing current census statistics provided for by law; for searching census records and supplying information with respect to age and citizenship certification; and for general administration, including enumerators at rates to be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem; \$7,100,000.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: On page 29, line 6, strike out the figure "\$7,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,500,000."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to save approximately \$600,000 in the Bureau of the Census. In 1920 the census figures showed \$23,300,000; in 1930 it was \$27,324,000; in 1940 it was \$42,971,000, and in 1950 it was \$86,195,000.

I understand there has been a slight cut made by the committee, and I think on the whole the committee has done a pretty good job as most of the committees have done since the first appropriation bill was considered.

The hearings indicate that there has been considerable testimony to the effect that they were making progress down there in the department in more efficient operation, and so on, and each year they promised more and more economy, but each year the cost goes up and up and up. So, here is an opportunity to save about \$600,000.

A review of the hearings for years past gives annual assurance that great economies are right around the corner, yet each budget request that comes before the Congress shows an increase over the previous year.

These statisticians have a novel way of showing savings. For example, Mr. Hansen testifies that significant savings have been accruing from year to year as a result of the operations of a staff who are to study improved methods. Then he makes this statement:

"Actually, because of similar efforts in the past, we succeeded in doing the last census

at a cost significantly below the cost of repeating the previous census."

Then he goes on to say that this alleged saving is about \$5,500,000.

A little later in the hearing the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] further pursued the matter and asked that a table be inserted in the record showing the cost of the last few censuses. This table appears on page 97 and shows the following costs:

|                  |              |
|------------------|--------------|
| 1920 census----- | \$23,300,000 |
| 1930 census----- | 27,324,381   |
| 1940 census----- | 42,971,652   |
| 1950 census----- | 86,195,876   |

Now, based on these figures how can you reconcile the testimony of Mr. Hansen since these figures clearly show that the 1950 census will exceed the cost of the 1940 census by over \$43,000,000?

You and I could not reconcile these figures, but the statisticians can. Do you know how? Simply by saying that it would cost \$39,000,000 more to take the 1940 census now because of cost increases, or almost double plus almost \$10,000,000 more because of population increase. Thus we find that by some strange process of reasoning \$43,000,000 extra cost becomes a \$5,500,000 profit. How in the world do you compute what it would cost you today to do what you did 10 years ago? I wonder how many computations were made before it came out right for them.

This sort of testimony permeates the hearings and I say that the only way to increase efficiency is to curtail funds and this reduction is modest indeed.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the chairman of the subcommittee will see fit to accept this amendment. If he does not, I hope that the Committee of the Whole will approve it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Chairman, I must say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that it is utterly impossible for the committee to agree to such a drastic reduction in the item, "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Census" as the one proposed in his amendment. It would utterly hamstring the Bureau of the Census and the vitally important work they are doing.

As is pointed out in the committee's report, the Congress appropriated for the very purposes mentioned in this paragraph of the bill in the fiscal year 1951 the amount of \$7,007,000. The amount recommended in this bill for the 1952 fiscal year is \$7,100,000 and no increase whatsoever over the 1951 amount, except insofar as mandatory within-grade promotions are concerned, and there is nothing we can do about such promotions, and except that in fiscal year 1952 there will be an additional workday over the number of workdays in the fiscal year 1951, and except that there is an increased workload in foreign trade and shipping statistics. The committee has already reduced by \$70,000 the amount of the budget estimates for this item.

This amendment, I must say, with all due respect to the fine gentleman from Mississippi, is proposed without sufficient reflection and deliberation and without

being based upon any concrete figures. It is just a blind meat-ax cut.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman says it is just a blind meat-ax proposition. The gentleman will admit, I hope, that the only way you can make economies in these departments is to cut them. I think the gentleman will agree with me that the hearings before his committee showed that the 1950 census cost \$43,000,000 more than the 1940 census.

Mr. ROONEY. That has nothing to do with the item to which he has offered his amendment. That has nothing whatever to do with it. That is an entirely different appropriation item. Does the gentleman suggest that his drastic cut be taken out of agricultural statistics?

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman does not suggest that it be taken out of any particular statistics; he suggests that these people can get along with \$600,000 less out of a total of \$7,100,000.

Mr. ROONEY. I cannot agree with the gentleman, Mr. Chairman. I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were—ayes 64, noes 68.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. COLMER and Mr. ROONEY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 73.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the acquisition and establishment by contract or purchase and hire of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of additional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; the acquisition of the necessary sites by lease, condemnation or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Weather Bureau stationed at remote localities not on foreign soil where such accommodations are not otherwise available; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$200,000 for emergency repairs and replacement of facilities damaged by fire, flood, or storm; to remain available until expended, \$20,000,000, of which \$12,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes: *Provided*, That authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts for such purposes may be exercised until June 30, 1952, and may hereafter be accounted for under this head: *Provided further*, That the consolidated appropriation under this head for the next preceding fiscal year is hereby consolidated with and made a part of this appropriation to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund: *Provided further*, That transfers may



be made from this appropriation to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration", for costs of maintenance and operation of aircraft for initial flight checking of facilities established under this appropriation (not to exceed \$325,000); for necessary expenses in connection with the transportation by air to and from and within the Territories of the United States of materials and equipment secured under this appropriation (not to exceed \$115,000); and for necessary administrative costs (not to exceed \$325,000): *Provided further*, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized during the current fiscal year to transfer without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, air-navigation and communication facilities, including appurtenances thereto, to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

#### THE FUTURE OF AVIATION

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, development of civil aviation for the continental United States has two schools of thought. One is the Standard Oil Co. idea, at the turn of the century, which was pictured in a cartoon of Rockefeller beside a rose bush plucking buds and saying:

In order to produce one American Beauty thousands of buds must be sacrificed.

The other school of thought is that every one of the 16,700 incorporated communities of the continental United States is entitled to commercial aviation, the small as well as the large; that feeder lines, large and small, connecting every community and locality where planned economy indicates a community should or will exist, should be permitted and encouraged.

To maintain a balanced economy we must have people live and earn their living in the communities where food and other necessities of life and the conveniences are produced and processed. Now more than ever we must have people live in every part of our country rather than crowd together in a few congested centers of population where living is or seems to be more attractive. To have people live in places which now seem remote, we must make those places convenient and desirable.

Our civil aviation development and incidentally our military aviation has suffered because we have pursued the Standard Oil Co. policy for development. Our aviation industry has been built upon the theory that centers of population, with radius of 50 miles have a certain air transportation potential; that a few large companies, made strong enough, can attract a certain amount of passenger and cargo business for air transportation and that over-all sound aviation development for the continental United States depends entirely upon the success of these companies. To insure their success the Federal Government has allowed those companies to pick the centers of population, with greatest traffic potential, without consideration for other forms of transportation which have built those centers and with-

out consideration for the vast areas outside those few centers of dense population. The Federal Government has nursed those few companies to maturity with Government subsidies and has denied commercial aviation to all of the 16,000 communities outside the approximately 700 selected and served by the scheduled airlines, to hold that vast field for development by the big airlines as and when they see fit.

The error in our planning and building today is that it is based entirely on service to the comparatively few rich centers of population, catering to the wealthy customers there to the exclusion of all the rest of us. It stresses building strong operating companies above service to our Nation.

The fallacy in the policy we are following today is that it assumes that a healthy strong national system of air facilities serving our approximately 700 largest cities is the formula for making aviation best serve our over-all national economy. It loses sight of the fact, the important fact, that only when aviation is made to serve all the people instead of a select few, will it be a true factor in developing our national economy.

We must not be misled by the CAB's sudden interest in feeder lines and its promises for the future of local service airlines. You probably have noticed during the last few days, the CAB has erased the name feeder lines and has substituted local service lines. Whenever the CAB or CAA get too deeply involved in a mess they lift themselves out by just changing a name. You will recall when CAB was on a spot over freedom of the air, it came up with a new name, the right of commercial flight. At another time CAA renamed the small urban airports airparks and spent a great deal of time and money educating the public to this new name, which was supposed to work magic in the small airport field.

What the CAB is now proposing for feeder lines, that is, to grant a few permits for a limited time and keep them under strict control is not the answer. No one is going to invest in an all-out effort to establish a feeder line with the prospect that just when he gets the business on a sound paying basis, he will be wiped out by the CAB refusing to renew his permit. No small operator can comply with all the CAB requirements for operation and have any time left to conduct his own business. In the final analysis the operation becomes Government controlled to the extent the operator is not permitted to use his own initiative. If the small operator shows any signs of success in spite of all the handicaps imposed he is liquidated on the grounds he might become a competitor of the scheduled airlines.

We would not take anything away from the existing scheduled airlines. We would strengthen them in every way possible, consistent with the right of all communities to commercial aviation. They are entitled to protection in the fields they have pioneered and fields for expansion if they will enter a race to

serve these new fields by expanding service to such areas before others do.

There is airspace for all types and all classes of operations. There is a class of service suitable for each community, large or small, from the little, single-engine operation between cities and towns of the lowest class to the large-plane operations between distant large cities. Any plan for sound national economy must envision all classes of operations, linked together; the little operator feeding to and receiving passenger, freight, and cargo from the class of operation just above and that in turn to and from the class of operation above it to the main-line operations.

In addition to helping attract people to places where we must have them live, by making the whole Nation more accessible and life more attractive, expanding aviation transportation to every community would result in great military advantage. The training our boys and girls would receive would fit them for military aviation just as the tractors, trucks, mechanized farm implements and machines in other industry have made the operation of mechanized ground war implements second nature to the rank and file of our youth.

As we see the picture shaping up today, civil aviation is in a critical position, and the clouds seem to be getting darker and heavier. Private flyers and the 900 applicants for feeder routes pending in 1942 before the CAB have just about given up all hope. CAB and CAA have at the behest of the big scheduled airlines successfully blocked development in the fields below the main-line operations.

Under the President's Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1950, all functions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration were transferred to the Secretary of Commerce. The performance of the functions of CAA have been delegated back to the Administrator of CAA. The Secretary of Commerce through an Assistant Secretary can exercise more control over CAA and the basic policy problems formerly the responsibility of the Administrator. There is no indication to date that the Secretary of Commerce will turn away from existing policies and foster and develop aviation for all the Nation. Our only hope, however, for the future of civil aviation lies with the Secretary of Commerce.

Whether civil aviation will be made available to all of us, as other forms of transportation have and be permitted to take its rightful place in the development of our Nation or be confined to the present dense centers of population, with emphasis on strengthening and expanding the present scheduled airlines to the exclusion of all others, depends on whether the airlines, through the White House, are able to dictate our national policy or the Secretary of Commerce will be permitted to make our civil aviation policy. If the Secretary of Commerce will place the progress and welfare of our Nation above the welfare of the scheduled airlines—if he will exercise his authority and responsibility and open the gates to private initiative in the great fields below the main-line



operations in the continental United States, there will follow a period of far reaching sound aviation development, unequalled in any other form of transportation development at any time in our Nation's history.

Restrictions imposed by the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration on commercial aviation below the scheduled operations should be removed and private initiative be permitted and encouraged to develop air transportation in the brackets below, as it developed the railroad, bus, and trucking industries, ahead of Federal regulation. If we will remove the regulations and prohibitions except for requiring certificated pilots, certified planes, and proof of ability to respond in damages and permit operations to get under way, imposing regulation only as and when abuses occur, private initiative will do the rest and aid, not harm the scheduled airlines.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including contract stenographic reporting services; employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or industries serving aviation; expenses of examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; \$3,550,000: *Provided*, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Board without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, and accessories surplus to the needs of such Departments.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I shall not offer amendments to restore to the bill the funds cut out by the committee for the very necessary purposes of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, as no doubt the Senate will consider these matters and take care of them when the time comes. It is all too frequently overlooked that the CAA is an operating agency not for the purposes of civil aviation alone but particularly for military aviation. One of the main reasons why we try so hard to promote civil aviation is the direct effect it has upon the conditions of readiness of our country for defense.

If there were no civil commercial aviation, it would be necessary for the Military Establishment to have always available large numbers of transport aircraft with currently proficient pilots and mechanics.

By encouraging commercial aviation we save enormous sums to the taxpayers through having those hundreds of transport aircraft and thousands of pilots and mechanics engaged meantime in useful work in the domestic and for-

eign commerce of our country and with practically all of that expense supported by the commercial users of the services provided—but ready to serve the national defense when called upon, and at very short notice indeed. If it were not so, then the cost of that many Government planes and pilots standing idly by, awaiting the event of emergency, would have to be borne by the taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, the best statement I have found in the hearings on this bill is contained on pages 299 and 300, and is as follows:

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES FOR MILITARY

Mr. STEFAN. I would like the record to show that, despite the billions of dollars being appropriated to the armed services, the public seldom realizes that it is the CAA that is called upon in emergencies. Very few people realize this.

Some people have come before us saying this is a controlled war and a police action. We have had them come before our committee from the State Department saying, "Now that war has broken out in the Far East," and so forth. When this emergency did break loose, the armed services were not really prepared to take care of the emergency in the Far East, and had it not been for the CAA the traffic pattern and their navigation facilities between California and Hawaii would have been something from which we could draw a lesson of unpreparedness. I have not talked to Mr. Nyrop about this, but is it not a fact when this crisis broke out in the Far East it was the CAA that came into the void and furnished that service for the armed services? Will you tell us about that?

Mr. NYROP. That is true. On the day that the war broke in Korea; the last few days in June, we were called upon immediately by the military services and had conferences in the Pentagon Building with regard to how we could increase our communications and their traffic-control services to the central Pacific route, from San Francisco to Honolulu, Midway, Wake, and Guam, to assist in the tremendous airlift that went on during that initial stage, and is still continuing.

We were also requested to furnish additional services to Seattle, to Anchorage, and out the Aleutian chain.

We immediately reprogramed approximately \$1,250,000. We transferred men from our domestic communications stations and from our domestic air-traffic-control stations to these international facilities.

Within a period of 7 days we were able to take care of the increased operations out of the San Francisco Bay area, and the air operations at Honolulu and Wake. We immediately increased the power on the aids to navigation, on the high-power homing beacons that we had at San Francisco, Honolulu and Wake, so that the military aircraft that had to go to Japan could actually use a homing procedure all the way through the Pacific. We took the emergency steps to install an ILS at Annette Island. We did such projects as that.

Within a period of 15 to 30 days we were completely ready and were handling all the traffic from the military, all that they could put through the Aleutian chain and central Pacific route.

Mr. STEFAN. I thought that the record ought to be complete on that because very few people knew that emergency situation and the void which the CAA filled to make possible that homing program for the pilots that went to Korea.

I had several of the pilots who were flying before this service was installed tell me

that had it not been for the services of the CAA they certainly would have seen a lot more casualties.

When the armed services come up with their billions of dollars of appropriations the general public thinks that they do the entire job. I think CAA should be given some encouragement and some statement of appreciation for the service that they actually rendered in time of need. I want to congratulate you.

Mr. ROONEY. I agree with you, Mr. STEFAN.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

For printing and binding the advance opinions, preliminary prints, and bound reports of the Court, \$91,200.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am wondering if the majority does not think we should rise pretty quickly now.

Mr. ROONEY. Why not finish the Judiciary until we get to the general provisions.

Mr. TABER. If we will stop at general provisions, that will be all right.

The Clerk read down to and including line 6 on page 57.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, has come to no resolution thereon.

#### RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1951.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,  
The Speaker,

House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am herewith submitting my resignation from the House Banking and Currency Committee, effective today.

Respectfully,

JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

#### ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 353).

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI of Illinois, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM J. DRINKWINE

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take



from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 997) for the relief of William J. Drinkwine, with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$2,100" and insert "\$2,002.50."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 323, Rept. No. 755) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

*Resolved*, That the second sentence of House Resolution 51 is hereby amended by inserting the words "or outside" after the word "within."

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 354, Rept. No. 756) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3298) to amend section 503 (b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

Mr. MITCHELL (on behalf of Mr. MADDEN), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 355, Rept. No. 757) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2982) to readjust postal rates, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and

report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

(Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

#### ADMIRAL FORREST P. SHERMAN

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, the flags in my home city of Melrose, Mass., are at half staff today in honor of the memory of Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, who has achieved greater distinction among the illustrious in the Nation's history than any other man who has called Melrose his home. Although born in the neighboring State of New Hampshire, he grew up and went to school in Melrose after the family moved there when Forrest was a boy. The people of Melrose have taken great pride in his career and are shocked and grieved at his sudden death. In their behalf I extend to his widow and family through the medium of the RECORD sincere and heartfelt sympathy.

Graduating from Melrose High School with top honors and from Annapolis second in his class his notable naval career had its beginning. The pages of naval history will forever record his brilliant exploit as captain in command of the carrier *Wasp* torpedoed in World War II, but there is another incident in his early life which has quite as much of the drama which brings a thrill to the heartstrings but also carries a touch of real prophecy. When a very young boy it was his pleasure to spend as much time as he could with his grandfather, a New Bedford sea captain, who taught him seamanship and naval lore while cruising in Buzzard's Bay. One day while out in a 21-foot catboat the grandfather suffered a heart attack and passed away. Heartbroken he yet remembered his lessons in the lore of the sea and in the finest naval tradition he lowered the flag to halfmast and brought the little craft with his grandfather's body aboard safely over the waters of Buzzard's Bay into New Bedford Harbor.

Thus perhaps was written in the stars where no man may read that Forrest Sherman, the boy of 12, was destined to write for himself a brilliant record in the naval hall of fame culminating in the responsible post of Chief of Naval Operations of the United States.

His untimely death came while he was engaged in a diplomatic mission abroad, a mission of great importance to our national defense. His capacity for leadership, his balanced judgment, and his qualities of statesmanship, along with his naval learning and ability, have insured for Admiral Sherman a place on the rolls of the greatest naval leaders of all time.

#### SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent to have that order vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today, July 25, 1951, is the deadline date for veterans who were discharged before July 25, 1945, to take advantage of the education and training benefits of the GI bill of rights.

I cannot let this day go by without expressing appreciation of the very fine work that the GIs have done in taking their training and what has been accomplished for the veterans.

Yesterday more than 1,000 World War II veterans applied for these benefits at the local regional office of the Veterans' Administration, but many of these will never receive that training because of a ruling by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that the law makes that not only must they apply before today's deadline but must actually be attending classes before midnight tonight. This interpretation alone has worked great hardship on many veterans because the schools of their choosing do not begin classes until later in the fall.

Several times in the past few months I have taken this floor to urge the immediate consideration of my bill, H. R. 1301, which would authorize a 2-year extension of this July 25 date. No attention has been paid to my pleas, and apparently none will be. It does not seem fair to many veterans who have been busily occupied in adjusting themselves to civilian life and raising families and now when they are ready to take up their education and training they are unable to do so.

I was one of the original sponsors of the GI bill of rights and it was not our intention to shut anyone out of receiving the benefits of this law. The benefits of this bill should be extended at once.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MURPHY (at the request of Mr. O'TOOLE).

Mr. CARNAHAN in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. WHITAKER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. BLATNIK in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an article.

Mr. YORTY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHELF and to include a radio address that was made over WHS in Louisville and WGN in Chicago.

Mr. GROSS and to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. STEFAN.

Mr. SCHWABE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.









Korea. Contributions equal in number and identical in kind are obviously impossible. Nevertheless it must be recognized that every free country, large and small, is vitally—and I should say equally—interested in world security.

Much has been said in the Congress and in public forums on all phases of our action in Korea. Discussion and honest criticism are in the best traditions of our people and are in fact essential to the working of our system of Government. As on other subjects, I welcome them in connection with our record in the United Nations. Throughout the world, Communist propaganda has of course sought to represent this country's action as imperialism dictated by material interests. I do not believe that, wherever the channels of opinion are free, our basic purposes will be misunderstood. Our action in the Korean crisis was not dictated by any American material interest there. We neither sought nor do we seek any special position or privilege in Korea. Our action in the crisis was motivated by our deep conviction of the importance of preventing a breakdown of the international security system and of the principles of the Charter. I was convinced then, and I am convinced now, that to have ignored the appeal of Korea for aid, to have stood aside from the assault upon the Charter, would have meant the end of the United Nations as a shield against aggression. It might have meant the end of any possibility that collective security could be made to work.

Under the Charter, the United Nations must afford protection against aggression, whether committed by big countries or by small countries. Just as the United Nations branded as aggression the original assault by the North Korean Communist regime, so it has branded as aggression the later intervention by the Chinese Communist regime and its attack upon United Nations forces. There are not two laws, one for small and one for large countries. Indeed it is hard to see how the United Nations could ever operate under such a double standard. This does not of course mean that the United Nations has acted blindly, without carefully considering the effects of its measures. In fact the record shows a most careful concern by the great majority of members, including this country, to avoid extension of the conflict and to preserve unity while maintaining our objective of resisting aggression.

While our primary and immediate task has been defense against aggression and the creation of collective measures for accomplishing this more effectively, we have not lost sight of the objective of creating an international security system based upon the reduction and control of armaments. In my statement to the General Assembly on October 24, 1950, I made clear our continued determination to work toward this goal in every practicable way.

The aggression against the United Nations has brought home to all peoples the imperative need for developing more effective means to deal with aggression within the framework of the United Nations. The Korean case has demon-

strated that the United Nations can act effectively against aggression through recommendations of the Security Council, or the General Assembly, if the Security Council is paralyzed by the veto. But in Korea the participating nations had to improvise their measures from the ground up.

It was to meet this need that the Secretary of State launched at the beginning of the General Assembly in September 1950 the proposals which were developed into the Uniting for Peace Resolution. Mr. Acheson said:

The world waits to see whether we can build on the start we have made. The United Nations must move forward energetically to develop a more adequate system of collective security. If it does not move forward, it will move back.

\* \* \* The General Assembly can and should organize itself to discharge its responsibility promptly and decisively if the Security Council is prevented from acting.

This resolution can mark the beginning of a great step forward in the development of the United Nations as an instrument for collective action to maintain peace and put down aggression. We place great hope in the program projected by this resolution, particularly the provisions relative to the maintenance by members of the United Nations of armed forces for possible service as United Nations units, and the Collective Measures Committee set up to study and report on possible methods of maintaining and strengthening international peace and security. We shall give our full support to the aims and objectives of the program and to the work of this committee in developing them.

Despite the emphasis which the United Nations has been compelled to give during the last year to action to meet aggression, it has intensified rather than slackened its various activities to promote human progress in attainment of other basic objectives of the Charter.

One of the fundamental human aspirations is the desire to control one's own destiny or, phrased in another way, to exercise the rights of self-government or independence. The organs of the United Nations which are charged with the responsibility of fulfilling the purposes of the Charter with respect to the development of non-self-governing people made notable progress during the past year. The United States has contributed fully to these efforts.

The United Nations has intensified its efforts to combat the perennial enemies of mankind—hunger, disease, and ignorance. Through many channels and in numerous programs, the United Nations and the specialized agencies have furthered the basic goal of "the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations." Of particular significance this past year was the inauguration of an expanded program of technical assistance for the economic development of underdeveloped countries. Some 56 countries of the free world have participated by making contributions, and 48 countries have initiated programs designed to use the facilities of the United Nations and specialized agencies in the development of their own

human and material resources and in raising their standards of living. The United States has actively supported these activities and will continue to do so.

The weakness and the strength of the United Nations manifested in 1950 were those of a human endeavor which is still in its infancy. Despite centuries of effort, nations have only recently been able to cooperate effectively on a worldwide scale to achieve security and their other common purposes. In our limited experience we have met with many difficulties and reverses and will meet more in the future. But we have also achieved tangible success, and this success gives ground for hope that we are moving ahead on the right track. It is essential for all of us to understand that a stable peace can be achieved only through long, hard work and sacrifice. I am sure that the people of this country and of practically all countries realize that the goal of peace is worth this work and this sacrifice.

Under the stress of events in 1950 the members of the United Nations did not, of course, always see completely eye to eye. Nevertheless as loyal members the great majority strove to accommodate their views and action to the fullest possible extent in the interest of the major purposes of the United Nations. No nation has a monopoly of wisdom. Even among peoples sincerely devoted to United Nations principles—the overwhelming majority—there are bound to be differences concerning the best methods of putting these principles into effect. When we attempt honestly and frankly to work out these differences in the common interest, no one nation can expect to have its way completely. But decisions that are the result of discussions by many countries have a moral and political force in the international community which unilateral decisions seldom have.

Two years ago I said that the first point of our four-point foreign-policy program would be "to give unfaltering support to the United Nations and related agencies" and "to continue to search for ways to strengthen their authority and increase their effectiveness."

The record of our participation in 1950, set forth in the following pages, shows that we have not faltered in our support. I know the American people are determined to persevere in this course.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 26, 1951.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 134]

|            |         |         |
|------------|---------|---------|
| Allen, La. | Bolling | Brooks  |
| Arends     | Boykin  | Busbey  |
| Barden     | Breen   | Bush    |
| Boggs, La. | Brehm   | Chatham |



|             |               |                |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| Coudert     | Hoffman, Ill. | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Curtis, Mo. | Holifield     | Perkins        |
| Dawson      | Irving        | Powell         |
| Dingell     | Judd          | Reams          |
| Durham      | Kelley, Pa.   | Shelley        |
| Engle       | Lucas         | Smith, Kans.   |
| Gavin       | Miller, N. Y. | Steed          |
| Gillette    | Morris        | Tackett        |
| Gore        | Moulder       | Vail           |
| Gwinn       | Murdock       | Wier           |
| Hall, Edwin | Murray, Tenn. | Wilson, Ind.   |
| Arthur      | Murray, Wis.  | Wood, Ga.      |
| Hallock     | Norblad       | Woodruff       |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 132 I am recorded as being absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 4740, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday the Clerk had read down to and including line 6 on page 57 of the bill. Before the Committee rose it had agreed to pass over temporarily the section on International Information and Educational Activities beginning on line 7 on page 13 of the bill until today when it shall be the first order of business.

There is now pending to that section the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER], who had been recognized for 10 minutes.

Without objection the Clerk will again report the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

The was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVENGER: On page 15, line 3, strike out "\$85,000,000" and insert "\$70,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. Is the gentleman from Ohio in favor of spending \$70,000,000 for the Voice of America Information Service?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I think after I am through with my speech you will get the answer.

Mr. Chairman, in asking for this time, I had considerable misgivings that I would touch off emotional oratory on this very important subject. This I do not wish to do. That front has been well covered. I want to justify this as a rational necessary action for this House to take. I am sure that no such sum as seventy millions would have been allowed had we moved along 3 months ago and marked up this bill following our action cutting eighty-nine millions off this fantastic building project.

We had allowed \$32,700,000 1 year ago and the actual appropriation to this activity was \$31,700,000, September 19, 1951, when the joint action of the two Houses was agreed to the sum of \$31,100,000, 1949; \$34,000,000, 1950; plus \$13,300,000 supplementals for building.

For 1951, the \$31,700,000 was allowed. Late in 1951 came supplementals for some \$98,500,000, which your subcommittee cut to about \$82,000,000, a sum of money none of the men connected with this program had the knowledge or experience to plan to spend. The result is this "oleo" of what the world and this Congress is justly dismayed and concerned about.

It has caused these men to turn to propaganda drives to sell their brain-storm to the American public and to light fires under Members of Congress. Speakers were always available to run here and there, before this and that group of intellectuals and naive and innocent do-gooders and one-worlders, almost rivaling the sales campaign of a famous Louisiana product for the cure of the ills of mankind. No man can read the more than 200 pages of hearings on this bill and follow our chairman the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] as he patiently tried to find out what made this outfit tick without realizing that they got many, many millions more than they had the capacity to use.

This \$85,000,000 is \$13,000,000 more than we are allowing the whole State Department for salaries and expenses which sum is \$73,000,000. We should not allow this army of employees to be recruited to a strength of 12,000 and permanently saddled on our sadly harassed people. In these State Department totals, for several years there appeared the sum of \$70,000,000 for displaced persons. Fondly did we on the committee hope that with passing last year of this item that we could bring you in a bill around \$200,000,000 or only ten times the amount of 1940, but this new sprawling, bawling colossus is eating up all that and crying to be doubled and redoubled like a bid in auction bridge.

It is an appeal to reason I am making. I apologize for the meager request I am making, but I hope you will sustain me in it. It is the best I can get for you with any hope for successful adoption.

What we need is a new American creed in foreign policy; one so plain all can understand, so short none can distort.

International information and educational activities conducted by the Department of State have been in progress for several years. The presumed purpose of the activities is to acquaint the people of other lands with American life and ideals and to develop in the hearts of other peoples friendship for the United States.

It is doubtful, as a matter of fact, whether the United States is as well thought of in other lands as before these activities were undertaken on the present extensive scale.

Propaganda seems to breed within itself a tendency to overstate, over-emphasize, and overindulge the virtues which it seeks to extoll.

It also breeds counterpropaganda and thus inspires in those who resent its extravagant claims an effort to publicize the ridiculous, the base, the unfortunate, and the unworthy aspects of the propagandist.

The propagandist who thus subjects itself to counterpropaganda provides the leads and openings for the adversary unless the activity is performed with the greatest of skill, acquired primarily by experience. Broad-scale propaganda is dangerous because the mistakes are so far reaching. Slowly growing activities are not likely to make many mistakes. There is time for deliberation. As experience is gained and techniques perfected, comprehensive activities become practical.

This effort at rapid development of grand-scale activities by the Department of State probably accounts for the basis of criticism which has been directed thereto.

The investigative report which has been submitted to this committee is superficial and not directed to fundamental questions. It deals with internal organization—a minor matter in a rapidly changing new activity. It criticizes the slowness of the Department in the addition of personnel. In fact, the Department should have been complimented for this. It could hardly hire people until it knew specifically what they should do, to whom they should report, and where they should work. A job must first exist with its duties clearly in the mind of the supervisor.

It—the report—complains of minor errors such as putting English books in private libraries. Some of this kind of error would normally occur and be corrected. Perhaps some of it occurred because the Department was rushed beyond its own idea of what it should do.

It complains of untrue representation of American life and inadequate treatment of certain subject matter; complaints probably justified.

But the investigative report does not go into fundamentals; for example:

First. An analysis and exposition of the result the Congress sought to accomplish by providing funds and directives for the activity.

Second. Where in the world most promising efforts in accomplishing the



purpose could be had and where new activity could best learn the pitfalls, without great risk of more harm than good.

Third. What kind of personnel in the way of education and experience should be hired and how well such standards have been applied in securing existing personnel.

Fourth. An analysis of persons or units of Government which should be the point of impact of the activity to secure the result Congress had in mind and whether the present activity is directed thereto and to what extent it is effective.

Fifth. An analysis of alternative means of securing the impact.

None of these fundamentals have been the subject of investigative report. Further investigative report might well consider among others the following:

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. What, if anything, does change the oriental mind, the German mind, the Russian mind, and the intelligentsia, the peasant, the coolie, the government man, the industrialist, and so forth.

Can people of other countries be made friendly to us by talking about ourselves or by talking about them? Perhaps we should broadcast his ideas, and his events, and extol his heroes. It is sure he cannot live here and people are interested in their own environment—not that of the moon.

We need an investigative report along these lines and as well a superficial critique of internal management minor errors.

I was a member of the Herter Subcommittee on Strategic and Critical Materials in 1947. In Europe I was amazed to find that the so-called agricultural experts of the State Department knew absolutely nothing about the great drought that covered the Corn Belt of the United States and decreased our corn crop by a billion bushels. We were making promises all over Europe which we could not keep; yet I found in Norway and Sweden that both citizens and officials knew all about our drought and about our crop conditions and a lot more about our country than our paid people employed by the State Department in the 9 countries which the committee visited. Let us rationalize this thing, and let us take away some of these precious millions before they clabber the thing up any worse and make it almost impossible to justify another appropriation therefor.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. Ordinarily I would not make this request, but in view of the fact I was absent in the Pennsylvania primaries and could not take part in the general debate on this bill, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 1:45 p. m.

Messrs. COX and CRAWFORD objected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2 o'clock, with the last 15 minutes reserved to the committee.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to have had the great honor recently to have represented this distinguished body on a mission that carried me over several continents and many thousands of miles. I have, in fact, just returned from that journey, which held for me and my traveling colleagues several striking lessons.

The overriding impression I gained from that experience is that in the conflict between the democratic man and the Stalinist man, the Red front is everywhere.

No corner of the world is spared the insidious and often harrowing efforts of the Kremlin conspirators to extend their domain.

Equally true is the fact that men of good will everywhere are looking to the United States for the leadership and the moral and physical strength that flow therefrom to counter, check, and overcome Russian expansionism; they are looking, too, for us to establish a condition of strength that will allow for a stabilized world situation to make possible an equitable peace.

When I say the Red front is everywhere I mean that literally. The battle for the extension of the Stalinist domain goes on night and day, round the clock, and the prizes are not only territory, ports, and raw materials but more importantly the hearts, minds, and souls of men.

Given the object lesson of the Kremlin's diabolical program, seeing how far and menacingly the confiscatory hand of the Politburo reaches, viewing the spiritual ruin and the dehumanized end products of Soviet nihilism, one can say in all truth and sincerity that he is thankful to God that we have a campaign of truth, and that the Voice of America is on the spiritual firing line.

Whatever may come in the way of cessation of hostilities in Korea, and we all fervently wish for an early and constructive solution of that problem whose toll has been heavy but unavoidable—whatever, I say may come of the negotiations, let us not for a moment delude ourselves that the fundamental issues between Russian nihilism and the western world have been adjusted.

If the guns should be silenced in Korea, we have every expectation that elsewhere throughout the world, the Soviet war of propaganda will continue unabated, and dangerous tensions will be blown up to the near-breaking point; it is almost a certainty that if quiet envelops the Korean front, the Soviet

war of words will be continued in other theaters with renewed fury.

We ignore only at our own peril the fact that the Soviets employ propaganda as a major instrument of policy both internally and externally. Over the bloody years of the forties, and in this already war-inflicted decade, dictators have shown that in many instances propaganda is more deadly than armament.

To realize how important the campaign of truth is to the preservation of western civilization, and as a vital arm in America's crusade of peace through freedom, one has only to think of the vast prison the Russian Empire has become, to dwell for a moment on the plight of the imprisoned souls in that spiritual and intellectual dungeon.

We must never cease trying to get the sunlight of truth to those poor people; we must never abandon them to the deadly fare of the lie, of inspired hate, to calculated distortions all of which degrade man and soil him in the sight of his Creator. To reach these prisoners we need the Voice of America.

By words and deeds we must go on showing our allies abroad that America is aroused in power spiritually and physically so as to restore situations of strength that will give the Soviet marauder pause—and we must register the conviction with the free world and others that if a resort of arms finally becomes necessary, the people of the United States will stand unflinchingly until the dread evil of Soviet aggression is destroyed. To carry on this effort of persuasion and conviction we need a strong Voice of America.

To the captive peoples of the satellite countries we must continue to bring, as the Voice of America is now doing, words of hope and encouragement and assurance; messages which will revive old memories and stir new hopes. Not the least dastardly and nefarious technique of Soviet nihilism is that it not only cancels out the future for the individual but it systematically and unmercifully destroys the past. Is it any wonder then that its unlucky victims, caught up in its spiritual void, so often yearn for the deliverance of death. Through the Voice of America we can sustain these innocent victims in hope.

The challenge we face is an unscrupulous enemy who seeks to transform the world of civilization into a jungle land populated with dehumanized automata. Be sure of it, Mr. Chairman, the Soviets have generated something base and terribly evil. They deny man the promptings of his soul, they befoul his intellect, they corrupt his values, they achieve if you please a metaphysical crisis until the victim is so confused, so mentally perverted, so at war with himself, so murderous of his finer self that liberation through the blind fury of physical destructiveness is a device eagerly embraced. Thus are legions of war indoctrinated and mobilized, thus are satellite countries crucified on crosses of their national honor, thus are increasing numbers of human beings converted into Soviet units for conquest.

This is the enemy, Mr. Chairman. Against him, planes and bombs and tanks are not enough. Armament is



necessary, and in great numbers, and accelerated production for total preparedness must be our keynote, but when all this is done and accomplished, I submit, Mr. Chairman, the job is only partly finished—with equal urgency we require the means to command the spiritual, intellectual and cultural firepower necessary to meet and defeat Soviet propaganda.

That is why we need a Voice of America that is ever stronger and more penetrating.

You ask me: "How about the Voice? Is it getting through the iron curtain?" The answer, gentlemen, is an emphatic "Yes!" Yes, the Voice is getting through and this despite the ambitious efforts of the Soviets to keep it out.

From the far reaches of the Baltic to the Pacific outpost of Vladivostok, from the sunny climes of Sevastopol to cold Murmansk, the Voice of America is getting through to the Russian people.

It is not for idle amusement that the politburo has ordered round-the-clock jamming behind the iron curtain to keep out the Voice of America. The concentrated, organized effort of the Kremlin to silence the Voice is the greatest possible tribute it could be paid. The truth hurts where the main traffic is in lies.

Does anyone doubt the Voice of America is hitting hard in the campaign of truth? Eloquent evidence of its telling effectiveness is to be found in the pages of Pravda, which reacts quickly and frequently with violence when the Voice has scored a hit; it is to be found in the testimony of defectors who have been fortunate to flee the captivity of the iron-curtain prison; it is to be had from American Embassy officials; yes, the Voice is being heard in all parts of Russia and throughout the satellite countries.

As we consider the matter of funds for the campaign of truth, it is pertinent for us to remind ourselves that last December 20 Czechoslovakia passed a law for the defense of peace which provides for penalties of from 1 to 10 years in jail for spreading "warmongering news," or "propaganda." Certainly such legislative action speaks volumes for the effectiveness of the Voice.

For a moment let us turn to Bulgaria from which country we have the written statement that employees of Radio Sofia base openly admitted that their station has fewer listeners than the Voice of America.

Again, Reuters News Agency, after a survey, is responsible for the statement that in Hungary "No one who can possibly help it ever misses the Voice of America." It is worthy of especial comment that in Hungary and Bulgaria the Communist regimes have enacted measures which look to sweeping regulations pointed at listeners to the Voice of America.

Everywhere signs are multiplying that frontiers of freedom are being extended as the Voice of America gets through.

By your own knowledge you are aware that the Voice currently is making a great political capital by asking in its broadcasts why Stalin does not publish in Russia Congress' message of friend-

ship to the Russian people. This constitutes a real poser for the Kremlin and the people who are hearing the Voice in Russia cannot help wondering why Stalin refuses to make the declaration of friendship public. And word travels quickly behind the iron curtain.

In just recent days, the Voice has been an effective instrument in exposing the unfair tactics of the Communists in the Kaesong negotiations, just as on June 6 it taunted Malik to declare himself unequivocally on peace in Korea.

The Voice of America constantly has told the facts on the Oatis case as it has attacked the Hungarian Communist regime on this "legal" farce.

It is an impressive report, Mr. Chairman, which shows that the Voice in the prior fiscal year increased its foreign-language programs from 29 to 46; in the last month, 6 new programs have been started and now the Voice is going into Stalin's home balliwick, Georgia.

You will be interested, I know, to learn that the Voice headquarters in this country now receives approximately 1,000 letters a day from listeners abroad, the vast majority of them attesting to its great worth, many of them containing constructive criticism, and not a few of them smuggled, probably at the risk of death, from behind the iron curtain.

I would ask you to remember, gentlemen, that the Voice of America is in itself only one phase of the many-sided campaign of truth, which has been well characterized as an "American insurance plan to try to prevent world chaos."

The campaign of truth is responsible for the establishment of United States information centers in 132 cities throughout the world, one recently having been closed in Budapest. Those centers are supplied with news, books, magazines, leaflets, maps, special exhibits. The International Motion Picture Division issuing the valuable medium of the film to tell our story in far-flung places. Motion picture experts are turning out a variety of films which are bringing the American Story to millions in an interesting, entertaining, and convincing way. In many areas of the globe, this is adjudged one of the most telling ways in which to get our story across.

Not to ply you with statistics but it is part of this campaign of truth story that the International Press and Publications Division produces news, feature materials, and pictures which reach more than 10,000 foreign newspapers and periodicals with an estimated readership of 90,000,000 people. The Wireless Bulletin issued by this division, and which is monitored by 60 of our diplomatic missions in many parts of the world, is a fast-moving news service which is produced in four editions for Europe, the Near East, Latin America, and the Far East. For the most part, each bulletin runs about 7,000 words. After it has been translated into the local language it is made available by our information service offices to foreign press agencies and newspapers. So again, is the American Story dramatically and tellingly unfolded.

Supplementing this unique information service is a 10-page Air Bulletin

that is sent out twice a week; also forwarded are special articles and magazine reprints from 250 American magazines; and by technical newsletters and pamphlets which provide basic information about the United States.

You gentlemen should be told that last year the Office of Information and Educational Exchange, the over-all title of these various functions we are discussing, printed and distributed 4,946,380 booklets and leaflets. This year output was increased to 50,250,000. This year some 50,200,000 posters have been distributed, carrying the free world theme. The figures show also that last year, the libraries conducted under this program were visited by more than 24,000,000 persons seeking the truth about the United States, and honest information about the world in which we live.

A very important part of the operations we are here considering is the exchange of persons program. Last year nearly 7,000 persons were exchanged with 56 foreign countries. This program has been found most effective in building world understanding.

Through the private enterprise unit activities many worth-while programs are stimulated and carried through to successful conclusion through the enlightened cooperation of American business and industry. Public-spirited book publishers have made thousands of textbook remainders available to the program; books, pamphlets, and magazines have been made available; and 48 State governments have given 283,000 booklets for distribution. Cultural affiliation has been a very profitable activity for us in winning friends and understanding of our way of life; the town affiliation program has brought notable results in international amity and progress. The letters from America campaign continues to grow in volume and influence.

So in virtually every conceivable form and way, the campaign of truth has progressed notably. I would be unfair to myself, Mr. Chairman, and to everything I cherish in life and my credo as an American who believes in man as a creature of God, endowed with inalienable rights, if I did not, at this crucial time, speak with all the force and sincerity I can summon in behalf of a strong and effective campaign of truth.

Speculate for a moment, if you will, upon the gross economic product of America and make a mental calculation of the substantial sums, reaching into the tens of millions, that are spent advertising those products to potential customers, and then compare those figures with the money that is herewith requested to advertise the greatest product America has to sell to the world: the story of American democracy, its works and achievement. By any measurement of good business practice, you can readily see that we fall short of what the trade would call an adequate budget.

It is only too well known that one of the wishes entertained in the Kremlin is that America, in her heroic response to the growing threat of Soviet expansionism, will so weaken herself that economic collapse will ensue and the international Communist conspiracy for



world mastery will be realized by default. None of us here in this Chamber wants to be profligate with public funds; we are aware that unwarranted expenditures from the National Treasury only help the enemy. Prudence and caution must be our guides in appropriating funds; now having said this, I also say that it would be an equally serious error to indulge in unsound economy in this vital matter.

For my part, I would favor a greatly expanded appropriation. I am firm in the conviction that more funds than are herein contemplated could be spent wisely and profitably in the campaign of truth, and to the advantage of America and the free world. Certainly when we consider the need and effectiveness of this program and then compare it with the expenditures for outright armaments, I contend we have seriously short-changed ourselves. All of you are aware, I am sure, that the politburo elevates propaganda to such a level of importance that Russia is outspending us in money, output and volume by a ratio of about 5 to 1 in this realm. And you may be sure that such would not be the case unless the masters of the Kremlin were convinced such activities paid off handsomely for their side.

But be that as it may, and sacrificing my personal desires in the matter, the fact remains that we are here confronted with a bill that makes provision for what I consider a minimum program. I would prefer much more and am certain I could make out a firm case for a higher figure, but certainly I will never agree to anything less than the committee has authorized.

Just so I am equally certain that my worthy colleagues of the committee who have wrestled long and earnestly with this matter—and we have had our strenuous but honest differences of opinion—are equally set that to cut below this total of \$85,000,000 would be a mistake of the first magnitude.

What I am doing, then, Mr. Chairman, is making a virtue of necessity and advocating a course of procedure which I am convinced is inadequate, but one which I now realize is practically necessitous.

Just for a moment, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, dwell on the mighty epic of integrity, idealism, sweat and honest labor, ingenuity, and great aspiring that go into the making of the American dream—all of which spell freedom.

Dwell then for the sake of contrast on the outrageous things that are being done in the name of Soviet expansionism: Naked aggression, the organized attack to drive God out of men's lives, the forced labor camps, the mock trials, the uprooting of families, with the attendant cruelties this forced exodus visits upon the very young and the aged—all of which spell slavery.

Think of those two pictures, speculate upon the kind of a world we will have in, say, 1984 or 1964, dependent upon which system prevails; consider that words are weapons in the hands of the enemy, then consult your conscience, and vote.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. Chairman, I think there is a place in this cold war for a sound and sensible Voice of America program. I am satisfied that at the present time the cut provided in the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Ohio is reasonable; \$70,000,000 is sufficient until the program is reorganized. I want to bring to bear in support of my position part of a radio broadcast which was made by Henry J. Taylor from Switzerland just last Monday evening. I think it is very important because he discussed this matter of the Voice program.

He goes on to point out that the people of Europe know that the United States is not militaristic; that we are not over there to acquire territory. But he points out that they are worried about something we may do to stir up a war. Let me read just part of what he says:

This brings me then to the main question worrying the Swiss—the same question I found worrying many leaders in Britain and France. Informed European leaders know America is not imperialistic. \* \* \* They know that American defense is, in fact, not only the defense of America but the intensive defense of the free world. In short, they do know that the intention of the United States is honestly and truly defensive.

"But," they ask, "does Stalin know it?" They say whether Stalin knows this or not is the main risk of war. The great worry among leaders I have talked with is that Stalin may confuse the United States of today with the Germany of the past. Once our arms are built up, once our ships are out of mothballs, and our soldiers trained, our tanks and artillery out of the factories, our airplanes standing on the airfields—does Stalin think he is going to be attacked then—like he was finally attacked by Hitler after Hitler finally got ready?

Stalin certainly does not understand America even as little as we understand Russia. He probably has no understandable idea why the United States went into the last war—Russia, under same conditions, would not have done so. In short, the American nature is probably a greater puzzle to Stalin than his nature is to us.

So come, for a moment, to the Kremlin itself. If you or I could ask Stalin one question—and could perform the magic of getting an honest answer—here is the overriding question we should ask: "Generalissimo Stalin, in your ignorance of America, have you made up your mind that in the long run, sooner or later, the United States will attack you, when America's arms are built up, as Germany attacked you when Germany was ready?" For if Stalin thinks that when we get all dressed up we are, in any case, going some place, and that the some place we are going is against him, he will try to beat us to the punch—if punch it is to be.

In such mistaken idea by Stalin of America long-term intention, European leaders see any main possibility of a new world war.

Accordingly, many are alarmed by much they hear broadcast, over here by the official Voice of America—the official radio program of our own State Department. It is constantly baiting Stalin, addressing broadcasts to him personally with great violence, taunting him, calling him a coward and a bluffer, and everything else. When I hear it much of its sounds to me like Nazi Goebbels talking directly to Stalin in language about as violent as Goebbels ever used.

European leaders are against appeasement. They don't like Stalin any better than we do. But they're also against what sounds to them like belligerence—absolute out-and-out belligerence by the United States. And if the Voice of America sounds like that to them, how must it sound to Stalin? Stalin will go to war, or not go to war, depending on what he thinks about his own future. To broadcast to him in language, tones and words like Goebbels did—and for all Russia to hear—is a profoundly important dangerous blunder. It contains within itself the disastrous possibility that Stalin may figure it's his neck anyway that we're after—and if it's going to be war from us sooner or later, as it was from Nazi Germany, he'd better beat us to the punch, for he would have less to lose by doing so, than by waiting until we got all built up and hit him first.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have spent 2 days on this particular bill in general debate. There are a few people who want to be heard under the 5-minute rule. We want to finish the bill today. I am not going to object to the gentleman having one additional minute, but I do feel constrained to object to any other extension of time during the discussion of this bill under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin—

And thus it could upset our whole assumption over here, namely, that Stalin is unwilling to risk all-out war, and that's why you'll find so many thoughtful Europeans actually more alarmed at this moment about America than about Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if at this time we cannot agree upon some limitation of debate.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have 5 minutes. Otherwise, I shall have to object.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I object to any such request.

The CHAIRMAN. No request has been made yet.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman was wondering. I was just putting an end to the wondering.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know what the gentleman from Minnesota is so worried about, but it is all right with me.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. We want sufficient time to discuss this matter.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not want to shut off anybody, but I think we should have some limitation of debate on this particular amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. After all, there is \$15,000,000 involved in this amendment. It should be worth a little of our time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.



Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I made a statement on the floor that the Soviet Union was spending between one and two billion dollars each year for propaganda purposes, the objective of which is to undermine the resistance to Communist domination in different nations, and the ultimate objective of dominating and enslaving all the peoples of the world. In connection with that I wish to call to the attention of the members of the committee that Jack McCloy, the High Commissioner in Germany, estimated that they are spending \$500,000,000 a year in Germany alone. I know that Jack McCloy is very highly regarded by many Members of this House and his opinion is certainly powerful evidence.

In North Korea we find that they had enrolled 1,300,000 Koreans in Soviet-Korean cultural societies.

In 1949 alone they translated into Korean and published some 500 Russian books. Of two of these books alone it has been found that they distributed 537,000 copies. Almost 70,000 lectures and concerts were given in North Korea by Soviet artists, writers, and others in 1 year.

In the Eightieth Congress there were set up two advisory commissions of distinguished citizens to study this program and report to the Congress semiannually on the progress of the program. Who are they? Harvie Branscomb, chancellor of Vanderbilt University.

Mark Starr, educational director, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, and that is a very sound, progressive union; there is no communism there.

Harold Willis Dodds, president of Princeton University.

Edwin B. Fred, president of the University of Wisconsin.

Martin R. P. McGuire, president of Catholic University.

There is the membership, and their report issued only a short while ago is one of commendation of the work being done by those in charge of this program. There is, of course, no such thing as perfection; there is no such thing as a perfect human being; I am not perfect; none of us is perfect, and you cannot have perfection; but there is the report they give to the Congress of the United States.

Here is the United States Advisory Commission on Information. They issue a very fine report saying this program is being efficiently administered, that its personnel has been greatly improved and is being steadily enriched by specialists of larger experience and talent; that the expansion authorized by the Eighty-first Congress as the campaign of truth is being effectively carried forward. Who are the men who make up this Commission? Let me read their names:

The Radio Advisory Committee which consists of the following persons: Judge Justin Miller, chairman of the board of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, and member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information.

Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor.

Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co.

Mark A. May, director of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale University.

Wesley I. Dumm, president, Associated Broadcasters, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.

Donley F. Feddersen, president, University Association for Professional Radio Education, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Jack W. Harris, general manager, Station KPRC, Houston, Tex.

Henry P. Johnston, general manager, Station WSGN, Birmingham, Ala.

Edward Noble, chairman of the board, American Broadcasting Co.

John F. Patt, president, Station WGAR, Cleveland, Ohio.

Meffort R. Runyon, executive vice president, American Cancer Society.

G. Richard Shafto, general manager, Station WIS, Columbia, S. C.

Hugh B. Terry, vice president and general manager, Station KLZ, Denver, Colo.

The general business advisory committee, which consists of the following persons:

Philip D. Reed, chairman—and member of the United States Advisory Commission on Information.

James A. Farley, chairman of the board, Coca-Cola Export Corp.

Ralph T. Reed, president, American Express Co.

W. Randolph Burgess, chairman of the executive committee, National City Bank of New York.

Sigurd S. Larmon, president, Young & Rubicam, Inc., advertising.

William M. Robbins, vice president for overseas operations, General Foods Corp.

David A. Shepard, executive assistant, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

J. P. Spang, Jr., president, Gillette Safety Razor Co.

Claude Robinson, president, Opinion Research Corp.

Warren Lee Pierson, chairman of the board, Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc.

Meyer Kestnbaum, president, Hart, Schaffner & Marx.

The work of the Ideological Committee is devoted to the consideration of special projects and participants in the work of this rotating committee are persons with outstanding experience in the field under study. Each meeting will consist of a new group of specialists. The first group of such specialists were:

George Gallup, Institute of Public Opinion.

George S. Counts, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Allen W. Dulles, director and president, Council on Foreign Relations.

Elmer Davis, news analyst, American Broadcasting Co.

Alexander Inkeles, Harvard University.

Now let us see what the policy of the Soviet Union is in the battle of minds on the ideological level. The Soviets have stated that there can be no breathing space in the ideological warfare. Pravda, which speaks the policy of the Soviet Union, in an item dated the 22d of June 1946, said:

On the ideological front we must and shall fight not by passive resistance but by active and increasing attack on the enemies. This is what the writing of Lenin and Stalin

teaches; this is in accordance with our traditions.

One further observation: I exhibit before you posters used by the Soviets in their propaganda villifying America and exalting the Soviet Union.

The committee has already reduced this item by \$30,000,000. It would seem to me that an additional reduction of \$15,000,000 would be unwise. I hope the amendment is not adopted.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

(Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Clevenger amendment to reduce the funds for the Voice of America. I am constrained to be considerably skeptical of all the rosy claims that are being made for this propaganda medium.

Propaganda of this sort is a delicate weapon, and its merit is hard to appraise. I have asked many people at random how they feel about propaganda of foreign nations in this country. In every case, they have replied either that they resent it or that it irritates them.

Consequently, I am inclined to wonder why there is so much confidence in the idea that other peoples will not be resentful or irritated by our propagandas. Are they a different type of humans?

The instructed-witness testimonials of the State Department concerning the effectiveness of the Voice of America leave me cold. I am much more inclined to be impressed by a survey recently conducted among 293 seniors at Silliman University High School in the Philippine Islands, as reported in a recent issue of the Christian Century.

That survey revealed that only 46 percent of these students believed that America is more concerned for the welfare of the peoples of the world than are the Russians.

With a statement that Russia is "an imperialistic nation which hides its greed for land and power by pretending to be a friend of the common man," only 47 percent agreed.

It was the opinion of 45 percent of the students that Russia would have done more for the Philippines if she had been in power there for the past two decades.

It was the belief of 45 percent that religious denominations are not prohibited from holding services in Russia, and of 55 percent, that more than one party was represented in Russian elections.

The foregoing record of the results of the Voice of America as it has performed in the Philippines is disillusioning, to say the least.

We have controlled the Philippines for five decades. We have spent hundreds of millions there, and we have many other advantages in our propaganda efforts with them. Yet, the foregoing survey reveals that our propaganda, especially the Voice of America, could be called a substantial flop in influencing the thinking of those people.

While this is but one piece of evidence, it is much more credible than a dozen of the instructed-witness testimonials of the State Department.



Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to report to the House about a recent experience of mine with the State Department, an experience which constrains me to support every effort to bring under control the reckless operations in that Department of the Government.

You all recall the contents of the State Department Formosa policy document, an official propaganda instruction sheet outlining tactics filled with deceit and double talk.

Following the revelation of that document, I sought from the State Department a list of the titles of similar Information Service guidances issued in 1950 and 1951.

It seemed reasonable to me that a Member of Congress might well inform himself a bit in this field after the shocking details of the Formosa paper.

I did not ask for the policy papers themselves. All I sought was a list of titles of such propaganda papers, so that I might have at least an inkling of what the State Department is doing in this field.

I was turned down with some pious phrases about the material being classified and confidential.

Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree with the proposition that sometimes material of this kind should be classified and confidential.

But I submit to the House that it is a highly unsatisfactory and unsound situation when a Member of Congress, representing the people of America, cannot get to see even the titles of propaganda directives by the State Department.

I suggest that the people would rather trust any and all Members of Congress in preference to any of the pinks, punks, and perverts that have been found nesting in the State Department.

The American people have lost confidence in the management of the State Department, and rightly so.

This is the same State Department that carried out unlimited collaboration with Russia during and after World War II. Until there is a house cleaning in that Department the American people are in constant peril. They are in the hands of a State Department that reeks with incompetence, or worse, in many of its branches.

That fact that it can, by unlimited propaganda, confuse and bewilder the Congress to the point where no effective clean-up is required, is a frightening phenomenon, and a menace to our system of Government.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:15, the last 15 minutes to be reserved to the committee and to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman's motion is not in order.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the latter part of the motion and

move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:15.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAWFORD), there were—ayes 84, noes 43.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 10 minutes of the time be allotted to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether we are up to mischief or not in reducing the appropriation for the Voice of America. I was impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack]. I agree that a billion dollars is not too much to pay for a good informational service. There was a time when I was a friend of the Voice of America and took pleasure in defending it. Referring to it some time ago, I made the statement that after Mr. Benton left the State Department that the Voice of America lapsed back into the sorry state that it had previously occupied. That statement, I am convinced, did an injustice to Mr. Barrett, and I wish to withdraw it. Mr. Barrett, I am confident, is an excellent gentleman and is doing his best to do a good job. His difficulty, in my opinion, is that it is impossible for him to do a good job in the atmosphere of the State Department in which he is operating. Freed of this influence will afford to multiply the appropriation here proposed a half dozen times.

What the country needs, badly needs, is the cleaning out of that Department, and it needs it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Miller].

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I wish we could have a strong Voice of America, one to which we could point with pride. The difficulty, I think, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], is that some of the personnel presently in the Department are not of the quality or caliber to give us a good program.

Six months before the Korean War broke out I was in Seoul. I had the opportunity there of listening to the Voice of America on two different occasions. I blushed with shame. I am sure every Member in this Chamber would have felt the voice did not represent America. It was not the Voice of America that I wanted to hear. I wanted to crawl away some place and apologize for it. I want a real strong, honest voice that gets results.

I was in England when the voice of the old OWI under Elmer Davis was operating, and that was no good.

Some of that propaganda they put out is very much like the material I received this morning in the mail from the Office of Price Stabilization. It is being sent out over my district. It is this "Mike at the dike" from the Pendergast machine in Missouri telling us what to do about inflation.

We have the domestic voice of inflation and the Voice of America. This is a part of the propaganda. It is similar to some of the Voice of America propaganda that is put out at the present time.

By propaganda we try to influence people, we try to influence nations. We use any method we can. I suppose if it is good propaganda I like it. If you do not like it, it does not please you. But I say to you that unless we can change the personnel, and that goes from the top in the State Department right down to the lower levels, some of the individuals who presently are handling the Voice of America and the policies of this country, the Voice of America ought to be given a decent burial. There are plenty of red blooded patriotic Americans to fill positions of trust. There is no need to employ those of questionable reputation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Bentsen].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, as one of the younger Members of this distinguished body, I do not often take the floor, but the Voice of America is a subject on which I have deep convictions.

The major tobacco companies of this country spent almost fifty-one million last year advertising 30-day smoking tests, your T zone, and not a cough in a carload, and yet we have men here opposing telling that story of the greatest thing ever created by the minds and hearts of men, American democracy. Millions spent to advertise cigarettes, and we hesitate to spend \$85,000,000 to tell the world of democracy—it just does not make sense.

America is a country of supersalesmen. We have developed advertising and salesmanship of our merchandise beyond any other nation. We are the best vendors in the world, but when it comes to selling our way of life we have just scratched the surface. People in foreign lands know the taste of Coca-Cola; let us also tell them about freedom of religion, a free press, the integrity and dignity of the individual, a Government in which the state serves its people and not the citizens serving as slaves to the state.

When it comes to selling toothpaste, soap, and, yes, even dog food, no one can compete with us.

But too long we have been content with the platitude, "That these things we hold to be self-evident," when we think of democracy. Self-evident to free men, yes, but not to those who read and listen to a censored press and radio. It is these people who must be reached. They must be told the true story of the United States. The Voice of America is an effective way of telling them.

This is a relatively new agency with an immense task before it. As all large



businesses or Government agencies new to their jobs, it has undoubtedly made mistakes and could be improved in its services. The opponents to this appropriation would be rendering the Nation a service by taking a position of telling how its functions can be improved, but the only position most have taken is one of opposition.

The Russians have become masters of propaganda. They have become so adept at telling the big lie often enough, that many of the world's people have swallowed the Communist line awakening too late to do much about it. We have only to look on our competitors to see the effectiveness of propaganda. Since the end of World War II, the slave masters of the Kremlin have extended their domination over the people of the world from 200,000,000 people to over 800,000,000, without doing battle.

The world is faced with a basic clash of doctrines. This is a battle for the minds of men.

I heard an opponent of this appropriation yesterday say the kind of democracy he believed in was one backed by the military might of America. Certainly such armed might is necessary and I have always voted for such appropriations. But perhaps those men would also like to join in the song Old Soldiers Never Die, but there are those of us who remember that young soldiers do. It is their lives that will be at stake if we lose this battle of communism versus democracy, the young will die in battle. The young men of this country stand ready to make any sacrifice for their Nation. But, we, as their representatives, should neglect no effort to try to avoid that sacrifice.

Winning this battle for the minds of men is just as important as a victory on the battlefield. It results in fewer Gold Star Mothers.

I will never be one who will overlook a chance to defeat the Communists in the fight of the big truth against the big lie. Win nations by telling them the truth, break through the propaganda shroud of the Kremlin, then the battle is won without firing a shot.

The bill for advertising the true story of democracy—of reaching those minds behind the iron curtain, helping stir revolution against dictators—is less than the price of our latest aircraft carrier. Must we, the most progressive nation in the world, depend entirely on brawn and neglect brains in this fight to defeat communism?

(Mr. BENTSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if this was truly the Voice of America, I personally would vote \$200,000,000 for it, if that much could be advantageously expended to counteract Soviet propaganda. But I am disturbed over what the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and others have informed us to the lack of constructive efforts by the group in control of this

program. I voted for the establishment of this program several years ago but I feel that it is more than a waste of money to approve the present operations.

Just study the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] of the other day and you will see the details. Let us keep this in mind. Even with this cut we are asking here this group will still have more money than they had available for the very same purposes for the fiscal year 1951—that is, if you do not take into consideration the construction money which was made available in supplemental appropriations and other appropriations in 1951. Why should we in all good common sense give this group more money than this past fiscal year and thus approve the job which they have not done by increasing the amount of money appropriated for them. I hope the Clevenger amendment will prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will we ever understand that we are in a war—partially hot in Korea and partially cold? This modern cold war emergency consists of three parts; military, economic, and ideological. This is the ideological phase we are debating here. We are probably going to vote \$60,000,000,000 for arms without batting an eye, and here we are trying to cut the heart out of this appropriation for a correlative element of our defense which the Subcommittee on Appropriations has already cut very materially. Certainly if this was a Voice of America program doing the full job that needs to be done we would vote it \$3,000,000,000.

It is not a complete ideological program and has many deficiencies but does that mean we have to shut it down and cripple it completely? It is analogous to me, to shutting down 20 percent of the power and light plant in your community because you do not like the management.

I, too, want a separate establishment for the foreign information program as does Senator BENTON. I want many other things, and I am going to fight for them. But in the meantime the Russians are stopping with their ideological warfare and we cannot stop here.

Mr. Chairman, what are a few of the things we are doing with this \$85,000,000? Just to show you how very little you can do with \$85,000,000—and if you cut it you will do even less than this inadequate amount—is the following:

Radio broadcasts—Voice of America—of 3 hours in Russian, 1½ hours to each of the Soviet's European satellites, 4 hours to China, and one-half hour each to India, Pakistan, Thailand, Malaya, and Indonesia;

Publication of less than 1 pamphlet, leaflet, or poster for each 15 persons in the free world;

Production of one 1-hour motion picture program every 2 weeks;

Translation of an average of less than 11 important and politically effective books into the languages of 30 countries, each of them vital to our defense effort;

Bringing to this country an average of about eight influential public opinion leaders from each of the free countries of the world; and

The operation of a world-wide news service, reading room, and general information program with an average of less than one American abroad for every million and a half persons in the free world.

I call your attention to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] just read to you of what the Russians did in one place—in North Korea—alone. I was going to read the same thing. Just compare the magnitude of that propaganda effort in only one country with our whole information job. That is the competition we must meet.

General Eisenhower said in his address to the Congress in February last that we need a strong Voice of America, "a very much stronger information service."

A private businessman like Cass Canfield, chairman of the board of Harper & Bros., writes to me as follows:

I am familiar with the State Department's book program. I think it is well administered, and feel very strongly now that it would be a great mistake to cut it below the modest amount expended in 1951.

That would mean retaining the committee's amount in the bill.

In view of what we are voting for arms, I ask you whether you want to tie our hands behind our backs just for the sake of this short-sighted kind of economy to save \$15,000,000 on a program vital to the national defense which the subcommittee has already cut \$30,000,000. I am for encouraging the subcommittee and not for crippling our own efforts in the ideological field in the grim struggle against communism by this kind of short-sighted economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to testify rather than to make a speech.

A few years ago it was my privilege, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, to visit a number of countries and the Arabian oil fields where four American companies, known as the Arabian-American Oil Co., had gone in as private industry, without a dime of subsidy, drilled wells and constructed a pipeline across to the Mediterranean, making the outlet several thousand miles closer.

There we talked, not the State Department, about whom disparaging reference has been made time and again, but rugged, hard-fisted American businessmen, representing free enterprises, at its best.

May I pause for a moment to say that I do not subscribe to some of the remarks that have been made because the Ambassadors that we found in the countries we visited, men like Allen, in Iran; Dunn, in Italy; Douglas MacArthur, and his su-



perior in Paris; and several others were all capable Americans. Their cry stands out in my memory above everything else, "Get us the Voice of America into these countries. The Russian propaganda is pouring in. What we need more than anything else is a true story of America through the Voice of America."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I took this time for the reason that in listening to the debate during the last 2 days I noted that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] had given testimony from lists of the higher-salaried employees in the State Department in categories which he himself had placed them in for the purpose of his discussion. I also notice that the RECORD for the last day does not show those lists and the gentleman did not incorporate them. I take this time today to ask our colleague [Mr. STEFAN] if he has any objection to putting those lists in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there any special purpose that the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. WERDEL. The special purpose I have in mind is that I believe the expanding nature of this budget is such that the Members have difficulty in understanding it unless they remain here on the floor. I think in the future, for this year and next year, it would be to the interest of all of us to turn to this part of the RECORD and look at the names of those gentlemen who handling the high-salaried jobs in the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that every one of the names in the State Department is included in the budget?

Mr. WERDEL. I am well aware of that. However, they are not categorized as the gentleman from Nebraska has done in connection with his remarks.

Mr. STEFAN. I have already had permission to extend my remarks and include such material. There is quite a voluminous list. The only list I have is in the office of the Secretary. Would the gentleman be satisfied to list those in the higher brackets?

Mr. WERDEL. Just in the higher brackets; yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Then I will place those in the RECORD at this point, under the permission previously given me.

Mr. WERDEL. I thank the gentleman.

The list referred to follows:

#### Office of the Secretary

| Name                  | Grade | Annual rate |
|-----------------------|-------|-------------|
| Dean Acheson          |       | \$22,500    |
| William D. Pawley     | GS-15 | 11,000      |
| Bromley K. Smith      | GS-15 | 10,500      |
| Marshall D. Shulman   | GS-14 | 8,800       |
| Lucius D. Battle      | GS-13 | 8,600       |
| Barbara Evans         | GS-13 | 7,600       |
| George William Foster | GS-13 | 7,600       |
| Mildred J. Ashjornson | GS-11 | 5,600       |
| Esther C. Grah        | GS-11 | 5,600       |
| Dorothy H. Morgret    | GS-9  | 4,850       |
| Mary L. Meyer         | GS-7  | 4,200       |
| Marie A. Benda        | GS-6  | 3,825       |
| Sara Nell Gregg       | GS-5  | 3,475       |

#### Office of the Secretary—Continued

| Name               | Grade | Annual rate |
|--------------------|-------|-------------|
| Ellen E. Burton    | GS-5  | \$3,225     |
| Katherine Gurnett  | GS-4  | 2,875       |
| Anita W. Pawley    | GS-4  | 2,875       |
| William J. Kelly   | GS-3  | 3,130       |
| James R. Warren    | GS-3  | 3,130       |
| James Thomas Payne | CPC-4 | 2,770       |
| George T. Eades    | CPC-3 | 2,732       |
| Total (20)         |       | 124,887     |

#### Policy planning staff and counselor

| Name                  | Grade | Annual rate |
|-----------------------|-------|-------------|
| George F. Kennan      |       | \$15,000    |
| Paul H. Nitze         | GS-18 | 14,000      |
| Walter Thurston       | GS-15 | 13,500      |
| Henry Villard         | GS-15 | 13,200      |
| Dorothy Fosdick       | GS-15 | 10,750      |
| Robert G. Hooker, Jr. | GS-15 | 10,750      |
| Carlton Savage        | GS-15 | 10,750      |
| Laampton Berry        | GS-15 | 10,750      |
| John Davies, Jr.      | GS-15 | 10,700      |
| John H. Ferguson      | GS-15 | 10,000      |
| Charles B. Marshall   | GS-15 | 10,000      |
| Robert W. Tufts       | GS-15 | 10,000      |
| Philip H. Watts       | GS-15 | 10,000      |
| Alace May Harvey      | GS-11 | 5,600       |
| Dorothy M. Hessman    | GS-9  | 4,725       |
| Helen C. Allison      | GS-9  | 4,600       |
| Velma A. Heine        | GS-7  | 4,325       |
| Amelia H. Allen       | GS-6  | 4,075       |
| Elizabeth N. Kosciw   | GS-6  | 3,825       |
| Maryl H. Woolford     | GS-6  | 3,825       |
| Jean Bryan            | GS-6  | 3,700       |
| Naomi Rene Sutphin    | GS-6  | 3,700       |
| Adele B. Slama        | GS-6  | 3,575       |
| Shirley B. Goodman    | GS-6  | 3,450       |
| Martha K. Pritting    | GS-5  | 3,725       |
| Nancy H. Matthews     | GS-4  | 2,875       |
| Lloyd Morarity        | CPC-4 | 2,752       |
| Total (27)            |       | 204,152     |

#### Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations

| Name                      | Grade | Annual rate |
|---------------------------|-------|-------------|
| Jack K. McFall            |       | \$15,000    |
| Ben H. Brown, Jr.         | GS-16 | 11,200      |
| Florence Kirlin           | GS-15 | 10,750      |
| Philander P. Claxton, Jr. | GS-15 | 10,750      |
| Horace H. Smith           | GS-15 | 10,750      |
| Allen B. Moreland         | GS-15 | 10,000      |
| George O. Gray            | GS-14 | 8,800       |
| Louise White              | GS-13 | 8,400       |
| Clara G. McMillan         | GS-13 | 7,600       |
| William H. Dodderidge     | GS-13 | 7,600       |
| Edith V. Mamish           | GS-9  | 5,100       |
| Bennie Mae Stevens        | GS-9  | 5,100       |
| B. Beatrice Ruffin        | GS-9  | 4,725       |
| Mary M. Walker            | GS-9  | 4,600       |
| Florence Grendon          | GS-7  | 4,075       |
| Annette F. Vollmer        | GS-7  | 3,950       |
| Milrae E. Jensen          | GS-7  | 3,825       |
| George Winnett, Jr.       | GS-7  | 3,825       |
| Louise Hines              | GS-6  | 4,075       |
| Ruth I. Filsinger         | GS-6  | 3,700       |
| Mary Ann Sames            | GS-6  | 3,450       |
| Norma Griffin             | GS-5  | 3,475       |
| Helen McAllister          | GS-5  | 3,100       |
| Barbara E. Mason          | GS-4  | 2,875       |
| Curtis A. White           | CPC-4 | 2,770       |
| James O. Holland          | CPC-3 | 2,412       |
| Total (26)                |       | 161,857     |

#### Office of the Ambassador at Large

| Name                | Grade | Annual rate |
|---------------------|-------|-------------|
| Philip C. Jessup    |       | \$25,000    |
| Walter N. Walmsley  | GS-15 | 10,700      |
| Max W. Bishop       | GS-15 | 10,330      |
| E. Vernice Anderson | GS-11 | 5,600       |
| M. Teresa Beach     | GS-9  | 4,600       |
| Carmen C. Crickman  | GS-7  | 4,575       |
| Sammie M. Venable   | GS-7  | 4,325       |
| Debbie R. Guiler    | GS-5  | 3,475       |
| Jo Ann Mintz        | GS-4  | 3,115       |
| Robert Hill, Jr.    | GS-4  | 2,450       |
| Total (10)          |       | 74,170      |

#### Salaries and expenses, Department of State, Bureau of Far Eastern Affairs

| Name                                              | Grade        | Salary   |
|---------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------|
| Office of the Assistant Secretary:                |              |          |
| Dean Rusk                                         | Unclassified | \$15,000 |
| Livingston T. Merchant                            | GS-17        | 12,200   |
| John K. Emmerson                                  | GS-15        | 10,330   |
| Merrill C. Gay                                    | GS-15        | 10,600   |
| Samuel T. Parelman                                | GS-15        | 10,060   |
| Ruth E. Bacon                                     | GS-15        | 10,090   |
| Philip Sullivan                                   | GS-14        | 8,800    |
| Cyrus Peake                                       | GS-14        | 9,800    |
| Robert C. Yost                                    | GS-14        | 8,800    |
| W. Gregory Hackler                                | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| Louise McNutt                                     | GS-11        | 5,400    |
| Frances H. Rawlings                               | GS-9         | 4,850    |
| Office of the Executive Director:                 |              |          |
| William D. Wright                                 | GS-15        | 10,700   |
| John G. DeGooyer                                  | GS-14        | 8,800    |
| Charlton Oghurn                                   | GS-14        | 8,800    |
| Harold Waddell                                    | GS-14        | 8,800    |
| Charles A. Wade                                   | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| Solomon Silver                                    | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| Basil Capella                                     | GS-13        | 8,000    |
| Walker W. Smith                                   | GS-12        | 6,400    |
| John W. Beckwith                                  | GS-12        | 7,600    |
| Thelbert F. Taylor                                | GS-12        | 6,400    |
| Ernest J. Hortum                                  | GS-11        | 5,400    |
| Wellington Z. Myers                               | GS-11        | 5,400    |
| Frank P. Lockhart                                 | GS-11        | 5,400    |
| John R. Heidemann                                 | GS-11        | 5,400    |
| Roland C. Fields                                  | GS-11        | 5,400    |
| Elizabeth Hallagan                                | GS-9         | 5,225    |
| Ruth Kelly                                        | GS-9         | 4,600    |
| Robert Johnson                                    | GS-9         | 4,600    |
| Office of Chinese Affairs:                        |              |          |
| Oliver E. Clubb                                   | GS-15        | 12,400   |
| Troy L. Perkins                                   | GS-15        | 10,600   |
| Robert W. Barnett                                 | GS-15        | 10,750   |
| Leonard L. Bacon                                  | GS-14        | 8,800    |
| Wallace W. Stuart                                 | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| Kathleen C. Dougall                               | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| Horace F. Amrine                                  | GS-13        | 8,000    |
| Ashley Guy Hope                                   | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| William O. Anderson                               | GS-12        | 6,400    |
| Richard Johnson                                   | GS-11        | 5,400    |
| Harrison Holland                                  | GS-9         | 4,725    |
| Office of Northeast Asian Affairs:                |              |          |
| U. Alexis Johnson                                 | GS-15        | 10,700   |
| Robert J. C. McClurkin                            | GS-15        | 11,000   |
| Gerald Warner                                     | GS-15        | 10,000   |
| Noel Hemmendinger                                 | GS-15        | 10,000   |
| Arthur B. Emmons, III                             | GS-14        | 8,800    |
| Robert Fearey                                     | GS-14        | 8,800    |
| C. Thayer White                                   | GS-14        | 8,800    |
| Willis Lory                                       | GS-13        | 8,400    |
| Douglas W. Overton                                | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| Charles A. Fraleigh                               | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| Joseph Carwell                                    | GS-13        | 8,000    |
| Edwin N. Cronk                                    | GS-13        | 7,800    |
| Selma G. Kallis                                   | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| Alice Dunning                                     | GS-12        | 6,400    |
| Henry Fralinghuysen                               | GS-11        | 5,400    |
| Walter Trueman                                    | GS-9         | 5,225    |
| Davy H. McCall                                    | GS-9         | 4,600    |
| Office of Philippine and Southeast Asian Affairs: |              |          |
| William S. B. Lacy                                | GS-15        | 10,000   |
| John F. Melby                                     | GS-15        | 10,000   |
| William M. Gibson                                 | GS-15        | 10,000   |
| Charles J. Shehan                                 | GS-15        | 10,000   |
| Kenneth P. Landon                                 | GS-14        | 9,800    |
| R. Austin Acly                                    | GS-14        | 8,800    |
| Leonard S. Tyson                                  | GS-14        | 8,800    |
| Robert E. Hoey                                    | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| Robert A. Burman                                  | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| James L. O'Sullivan                               | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| Wymberly DeR. Coerr                               | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| John F. Shaw                                      | GS-13        | 7,600    |
| Francis G. Jarvis                                 | GS-13        | 8,200    |
| Benjamin Bock                                     | GS-12        | 6,800    |
| Temple Wanamaker                                  | GS-12        | 6,400    |
| Dallas M. Coors                                   | GS-11        | 5,400    |
| Henry Williamson                                  | GS-11        | 5,400    |
| E. Edward Schefer                                 | GS-9         | 5,350    |

#### Office of the Under Secretary (including Atomic Energy staff)

| Name                 | Grade | Annual rate |
|----------------------|-------|-------------|
| James E. Weeb        |       | \$17,500    |
| R. Gordon Arneson    | GS-16 | 11,200      |
| Lloyd A. Lehrhas     | GS-15 | 10,750      |
| Joseph A. Frank      | GS-15 | 10,750      |
| Graham R. Hall       | GS-15 | 10,000      |
| Joseph Chase         | GS-14 | 8,800       |
| J. Bruce Hamilton    | GS-13 | 7,600       |
| Robert A. Low        | GS-13 | 7,600       |
| David H. McKillop    | GS-13 | 7,600       |
| Gladys E. Schukraft  | GS-12 | 6,400       |
| Helen C. Dougherty   | GS-9  | 4,975       |
| Josephine Deskin     | GS-8  | 4,450       |
| Elizabeth A. Garrett | GS-5  | 3,475       |
| Betty D. Bowman      | GS-6  | 3,450       |



## Office of the Under Secretary (including Atomic Energy staff)—Continued

| Name                     | Grade      | Annual rate |
|--------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Bernice Holstein.....    | GS-5.....  | \$3, 100    |
| Genevieve L. West.....   | GS-5.....  | 3, 100      |
| Daisy A. McClure.....    | GS-4.....  | 2, 875      |
| Katherine W. Murray..... | GS-3.....  | 2, 650      |
| Stephen Payne.....       | CPC-4..... | 2, 930      |
| Truman McCray.....       | CPC-4..... | 2, 770      |
| Total (20).....          |            | 131, 975    |

## Office of the Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife

| Name                    | Grade      | Annual rate |
|-------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Wilbert M. Chapman..... | GS-15..... | \$10, 750   |
| Isla V. Davies.....     | GS-13..... | 7, 600      |
| Warren F. Looney.....   | GS-13..... | 7, 600      |
| Fred E. Taylor.....     | GS-12..... | 6, 400      |
| Dorothy G. Peacock..... | GS-6.....  | 3, 950      |
| Betty F. Blackwood..... | GS-5.....  | 3, 100      |
| Marion D. Harris.....   | GS-3.....  | 2, 810      |
| Doris K. Orton.....     | GS-3.....  | 2, 730      |
| Total (8).....          |            | 44, 940     |

## Office of the Science Adviser

| Name                                                 | Grade      | Annual rate |
|------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Joseph B. Koepfli.....                               | GS-15..... | \$11, 000   |
| Walter M. Rudolph.....                               | GS-14..... | 8, 800      |
| Betty I. Wright.....                                 | GS-5.....  | 3, 350      |
| Mildred L. Shaver.....                               | GS-5.....  | 3, 225      |
| Joyce A. Christie.....                               | GS-5.....  | 3, 100      |
| Total (5).....                                       |            | 29, 475     |
| Grand total, Office of the Under Secretary (33)..... |            | 206, 390    |

## Deputy Under Secretary

| Name                      | Grade      | Annual rate |
|---------------------------|------------|-------------|
| H. Freeman Matthews.....  |            | \$15, 000   |
| Aaron S. Brown.....       | GS-15..... | 10, 000     |
| Frederick E. Nolting..... | GS-15..... | 10, 000     |
| Marion A. Johnston.....   | GS-12..... | 7, 000      |
| Ann K. Hartwell.....      | GS-9.....  | 4, 975      |
| Audrey C. Hastings.....   | GS-7.....  | 4, 200      |
| Altus J. Ackerman.....    | GS-5.....  | 3, 475      |
| Richard L. Spells.....    | GS-4.....  | 2, 930      |
| Total (8).....            |            | 57, 580     |

## Executive Secretariat, Office of the Director

| Name                         | Grade      | Annual rate |
|------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| William J. McWilliams.....   | GS-16..... | \$11, 200   |
| William J. Sheppard.....     | GS-15..... | 10, 750     |
| James Joseph Byrnes, Jr..... | GS-14..... | 8, 800      |
| Austin P. Sullivan.....      | GS-14..... | 8, 800      |
| Walter Q. Wilgus.....        | GS-14..... | 8, 800      |
| Fred L. Hadsel.....          | GS-13..... | 7, 800      |
| Francis E. Meloy, Jr.....    | GS-13..... | 7, 600      |
| Vera Eileen Evans.....       | GS-9.....  | 4, 600      |
| Robert F. Salm.....          | GS-9.....  | 4, 600      |
| Amelia R. Kuhlman.....       | GS-7.....  | 4, 575      |
| Burnita L. O'Day.....        | GS-7.....  | 4, 200      |
| Mary W. Butler.....          | GS-7.....  | 4, 075      |
| Jane Hunsinger.....          | GS-6.....  | 3, 100      |
| Peggy D. Lucas.....          | GS-5.....  | 3, 100      |
| William Farrell.....         | GS-4.....  | 2, 875      |
| Eva Ann Levicki.....         | GS-4.....  | 2, 875      |
| Maureen Mulqueen.....        | GS-4.....  | 2, 875      |
| William E. Brown.....        | GS-2.....  | 2, 850      |
| William H. Moore.....        | CPC-3..... | 2, 412      |
| Total (19).....              |            | 105, 887    |

## Executive Secretariat, Protocol Staff

| Name                       | Grade      | Annual rate |
|----------------------------|------------|-------------|
| John F. Simmons.....       | GS-15..... | \$13, 500   |
| H. Charles Spruiks.....    | GS-14..... | 9, 400      |
| Raymond D. Muir.....       | GS-14..... | 9, 200      |
| Edward W. Nash.....        | GS-13..... | 8, 000      |
| Milton Mitchell.....       | GS-12..... | 6, 400      |
| Lois Allee Williams.....   | GS-11..... | 5, 400      |
| Mary E. Madden.....        | GS-9.....  | 5, 100      |
| Leonice K. Bechtold.....   | GS-7.....  | 4, 575      |
| Louise K. Nichols.....     | GS-7.....  | 4, 575      |
| Katherine E. Larid.....    | GS-7.....  | 4, 200      |
| Faye Bush.....             | GS-7.....  | 4, 075      |
| Katherine L. Fenner.....   | GS-7.....  | 3, 950      |
| Jeanette J. Megaw.....     | GS-7.....  | 3, 825      |
| Milton M. Layton.....      | GS-6.....  | 3, 700      |
| Charles E. Hatten.....     | GS-5.....  | 3, 850      |
| Ruth E. Silloway.....      | GS-5.....  | 3, 850      |
| Katherine Carl Hayden..... | GS-5.....  | 3, 725      |
| Ann B. Bolling.....        | GS-5.....  | 3, 350      |
| Marjorie C. Regan.....     | GS-5.....  | 3, 350      |
| Harriette S. Sliver.....   | GS-5.....  | 3, 225      |
| Ruth Speakman.....         | GS-5.....  | 3, 225      |
| Nola C. Hrenchir.....      | GS-4.....  | 3, 275      |
| Elsie J. E. Nurm.....      | GS-4.....  | 3, 275      |
| Eula M. Thompson.....      | GS-4.....  | 3, 115      |
| Patricia M. Herbert.....   | GS-4.....  | 2, 875      |
| D. Marie Fitzpatrick.....  | GS-3.....  | 2, 890      |
| Total (26).....            |            | 125, 905    |

## Executive Secretariat, Policy Reports Staff

| Name                          | Grade      | Annual rate |
|-------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Robert G. Barnes.....         | GS-15..... | \$10, 000   |
| Jeffrey C. Kitehen.....       | GS-13..... | 7, 600      |
| Melvin L. Manfull.....        | GS-13..... | 7, 600      |
| Robert M. Berry.....          | GS-11..... | 5, 400      |
| Stuart Blow.....              | GS-11..... | 5, 400      |
| Robert C. F. Gordon.....      | GS-9.....  | 4, 600      |
| Florence Jeanne Wilson.....   | GS-9.....  | 4, 600      |
| Tomena Jo Thoreson.....       | GS-7.....  | 4, 575      |
| Theresa D. Sturgeoh.....      | GS-7.....  | 3, 825      |
| Doris M. Mahon.....           | GS-6.....  | 3, 575      |
| Marianne B. Duncan.....       | GS-5.....  | 3, 350      |
| Gloria P. Maraseo.....        | GS-5.....  | 3, 350      |
| Anita M. Haskell.....         | GS-5.....  | 3, 225      |
| Vivian M. Snipes.....         | GS-5.....  | 3, 225      |
| Lucetia L. Quinn.....         | GS-5.....  | 3, 100      |
| Clyde F. Roberts, Jr.....     | GS-5.....  | 3, 100      |
| Mary McClintock Rice.....     | GS-4.....  | 3, 275      |
| Florence E. Ekman.....        | GS-4.....  | 2, 875      |
| Mary J. Gallagher.....        | GS-3.....  | 2, 650      |
| William H. Cleysteen, Jr..... | GS-3.....  | 2, 650      |
| Mary E. Herron.....           | GS-3.....  | 2, 650      |
| Elsie E. Plater.....          | CPC-3..... | 2, 732      |
| Lloyd T. Maul.....            | CPC-3..... | 2, 492      |
| William A. Scott.....         | CPC-3..... | 2, 492      |
| Total (24).....               |            | 98, 341     |

## Executive Secretariat, Committee Secretariat Staff

| Name                                          | Grade      | Annual rate |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Earl D. Sohm.....                             | GS-14..... | \$8, 800    |
| Bradley H. Patterson, Jr.....                 | GS-13..... | 7, 600      |
| Albert P. Toner.....                          | GS-13..... | 7, 600      |
| Joseph M. Gerrety.....                        | GS-12..... | 6, 400      |
| Robert G. Efteland.....                       | GS-11..... | 5, 400      |
| Robbins P. Gilman.....                        | GS-11..... | 5, 400      |
| Charles T. Lloyd.....                         | GS-11..... | 5, 400      |
| Albert M. Cornelius.....                      | GS-9.....  | 4, 600      |
| Wallace R. Lampshire.....                     | GS-9.....  | 4, 600      |
| Donald Degan.....                             | GS-7.....  | 4, 075      |
| Ada M. Van Hise.....                          | GS-7.....  | 4, 075      |
| Frank C. Coleord, Jr.....                     | GS-7.....  | 3, 825      |
| Gerhard J. Drechsler.....                     | GS-7.....  | 3, 825      |
| K. Geniel Clay.....                           | GS-6.....  | 3, 700      |
| Ann M. Lydon.....                             | GS-5.....  | 3, 350      |
| Celia Barmaek.....                            | GS-5.....  | 3, 225      |
| Yvonne T. Meuers.....                         | GS-5.....  | 3, 225      |
| Vera M. Anderson.....                         | GS-5.....  | 3, 100      |
| Deloris A. Naylor.....                        | GS-5.....  | 3, 100      |
| Katherine L. Russell.....                     | GS-4.....  | 3, 355      |
| Pauline K. Williamson.....                    | GS-4.....  | 3, 115      |
| Susan Shields.....                            | GS-4.....  | 3, 035      |
| Helen D. Hill.....                            | GS-4.....  | 2, 955      |
| Dulcie Mac Chalfa.....                        | GS-4.....  | 2, 875      |
| Anna B. Caherty.....                          | GS-3.....  | 2, 730      |
| Betty A. Melton.....                          | GS-3.....  | 2, 730      |
| Jerome A. Perkins.....                        | GS-2.....  | 2, 450      |
| Total (27).....                               |            | 114, 545    |
| Grand total, Executive Secretariat (113)..... |            | 527, 703    |

## Special Assistant for Press Relations

| Name                            | Grade      | Annual rate |
|---------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Michael J. McDermott.....       | GS-15..... | \$10, 750   |
| Carroll Kilpatrick.....         | GS-15..... | 10, 000     |
| Lincoln White.....              | GS-15..... | 10, 000     |
| Reginald P. Mitchell (FSO)..... | GS-13..... | 7, 600      |
| Joseph W. Reap.....             | GS-12..... | 6, 400      |
| Wilfred J. Duda.....            | GS-11..... | 6, 000      |
| John B. Penfold.....            | GS-11..... | 5, 800      |
| Sarah F. Glancy.....            | GS-8.....  | 4, 700      |
| Margaret J. Halden.....         | GS-7.....  | 4, 575      |
| Eugenia E. Sheats.....          | GS-7.....  | 4, 575      |
| Virginia J. Hudson.....         | GS-7.....  | 4, 325      |
| Alice M. Griffith.....          | GS-7.....  | 3, 950      |
| Mary R. Holway.....             | GS-5.....  | 3, 850      |
| Alice McGavack.....             | GS-5.....  | 3, 850      |
| Augusta H. Wagner.....          | GS-5.....  | 3, 850      |
| Lula S. Matheny.....            | GS-5.....  | 3, 725      |
| Jewel H. Himebaugh.....         | GS-5.....  | 3, 600      |
| Elizabeth F. Coakley.....       | GS-5.....  | 3, 475      |
| Nell G. Cromer.....             | GS-5.....  | 3, 475      |
| Henrietta E. Avery.....         | GS-4.....  | 3, 355      |
| Jeanie L. Thigpen.....          | GS-3.....  | 2, 810      |
| Margaret D. Thomas.....         | GS-2.....  | 2, 610      |
| Charles M. Johnson.....         | CPC-3..... | 2, 732      |
| Eugene S. Miller.....           | CPC-3..... | 2, 332      |
| Total (24).....                 |            | 118, 339    |

## Executive Secretariat, Correspondence Review Staff

| Name                       | Grade      | Annual rate |
|----------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Blanche Rule Halla.....    | GS-13..... | \$8, 200    |
| Helen L. Daniel.....       | GS-12..... | 6, 400      |
| Sarah D. Moore.....        | GS-12..... | 6, 400      |
| Eunice A. Lincoln.....     | GS-9.....  | 5, 350      |
| Zolita F. Kent.....        | GS-9.....  | 5, 100      |
| M. Elizabeth Denham.....   | GS-9.....  | 5, 100      |
| Lillian C. Roberts.....    | GS-9.....  | 5, 100      |
| Mary G. Laekey.....        | GS-7.....  | 4, 575      |
| Lillian C. Wall.....       | GS-7.....  | 4, 575      |
| Edna M. Lindsay.....       | GS-7.....  | 4, 450      |
| Esther S. Kauffman.....    | GS-7.....  | 4, 325      |
| Christine S. Hood.....     | GS-7.....  | 4, 200      |
| Elizabeth M. Anderson..... | GS-7.....  | 4, 075      |
| Margaret Jennings.....     | GS-7.....  | 4, 075      |
| Grace T. Kalness.....      | GS-7.....  | 4, 075      |
| Pauline F. Spafford.....   | GS-7.....  | 4, 075      |
| Cleola B. Myers.....       | GS-4.....  | 2, 955      |
| Total (17).....            |            | 83, 030     |

(Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, there are over 800,000,000 people in the countries now controlled by the rulers of Soviet Russia.

This is approximately 34 percent of the population of the entire world. This great mass of humanity is the foundation on which the Kremlin must depend for strength.

Not all of these 800,000,000 people, however, are willing subjects of Moscow. The ten to twenty million men and women in Russian slave labor camps are witness to the fact that not all, even among the Russians, are content. Millions in the satellite countries are equally unhappy. Daily reports from inside the iron curtain—Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, and so forth—confirm this.

In the battle for men's minds these oppressed and dissatisfied people are potential allies for the free world.

We need these allies.

Our problem is how to reach them.

The Voice of America is the best answer we have to date come up with.

Just how much the Voice has had to do with sporadic uprisings behind the iron curtain is, of course, hard to gage. No one can honestly and truthfully deny



but what it has played its part. The expensive efforts of the Kremlin to jam the broadcasts are an admission of their respect for its influence. They dare not let the people of Russia or the satellites know the truth. Their future depend on keeping these millions in darkness and in ignorance. Our chance is to give these same millions the truth which carries with it encouragement and hope.

To silence the Voice now or to prevent its expansion would be to throw away one of our most valuable and least expensive weapons in the present struggle between the free world and the Soviet world.

It would be to deprive our friends behind the curtain of help and encouragement in the battle they, too, are waging.

Sound judgment and common decency demand that we continue and expand the Voice of America. It is a powerful and effective Voice of truth and hope.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, my position this afternoon is unusual. I am like many others, a critic to a large extent of the Voice of America. I feel, however, that we would make a very grave mistake to approve the Clevenger amendment.

I was one of those who served with a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that 2 or 3 months ago cut the Voice of America funds from \$97,500,000 to \$9,500,000. At the present time, after having spent considerable time and effort investigating personally the operations of the Voice of America and related agencies, I do not feel that we should make this additional cut as proposed. In no way do I condone many of the operations of the Voice of America. For example, I have in my possession today some of the radio scripts that I think are unwise, particularly if the Voice of America wants bipartisan support. These radio scripts criticize and disparage by implication, some very prominent public figures. I firmly believe the agency could pursue a less partisan position and in addition improve the quality of the program. Nevertheless, even if we do not like all phases of the operations of the Voice it does not justify slashing the funds further than recommended by the committee.

Let us review for a minute what has been done already by this subcommittee from the economy point of view. The Voice of America or the United States Information and Education Program requested \$115,000,000 for the current year's operations. The subcommittee cut \$30,000,000 from the budget request and gave the agency \$85,000,000 for this 12 months. In addition another \$10,000,000 cut was made; so, altogether this year you are going to have a \$40,000,000 cut out of a \$125,000,000 request. If you approve the Clevenger amendment, you are going to have an additional \$15,000,000 cut.

The reason I do not like to see a cut made any deeper than has already been made is because I fear that such a reduction might do away with some of the highly essential operations of the Voice of America and related agencies. Recently this particular danger was vividly

brought to my attention by a letter I received from a very long and very close personal friend, a doctor who happens to be in Pakistan at the present time. I will read excerpts from his letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Marshall] is recognized.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if that was a unanimous-consent request—

The CHAIRMAN. It was not a unanimous-consent request; the gentleman from Minnesota was recognized and yielded to the gentleman from Michigan, which he had a right to do.

Mr. FORD. This letter is from a friend of mine who happens to be a physician and surgeon in Pakistan. He writes as follows, and I think every Member should listen to this very closely:

I am now a surgeon attached to the United Christian Hospital in Lahore, serving as rather an independent missionary. I think we have the only plastic-surgery clinic in Asia, and we are building a modern American hospital in the country which is at an extremely low ebb medically.

We have stepped into this medical vacuum and are trying to do a good job as Americans in an area which is under heavy fire from Soviet propaganda. There is a growing antipathy toward the western democracies in this part of the world, as the feeling of nationalism in the countries so long under domination of the west increases. The situation is very cleverly exploited by Soviet Russia, and it seems to me they have handled their campaign with disturbing efficiency.

Much to the dismay of our State Department, the Soviets swamped a medical conference a couple months ago with prominent Russian doctors, and got the key places on the program. I was invited to attend at the last minute through the aid and assistance of Ambassador Avra M. Warren as a representative of the United States, and was given a place on the program through the courtesy of the Pakistan Medical Conference Program Committee. The Soviet scientists gave out with 100 percent propaganda from beginning to end, but they were given an ovation before and after every speech regardless. My own talk, which was purely surgical and illustrated with color movies, was well received, and I was besieged afterward by students who wanted to know all about medicine and medical education in the United States of America. Later in the Soviet Embassy there in Karachi we delegates were treated to another barrage of Soviet propaganda in the form of beautiful color movies purporting to show that all was peaches and cream behind the iron curtain.

Mr. MARSHALL. That substantiates the information I have received from former Congressman Gale, of Minnesota, that the Office of Information is doing a splendid job in that part of the world.

(Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Sutton].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, it is a crying shame that some Members are opposing this amendment because of certain individuals they do not like and not thinking about the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this letter goes on further to say:

This is an informal letter to a friend, and not any formal report to my Congressman. I am in no position to incur the wrath of the State Department, or dabble in politics, either Pakistan or American. My chief job is to provide expert surgical help to a diseased and underprivileged people, and that job I thoroughly enjoy. However, I am intent on serving my country here in any way I can, and I am prepared to do almost anything to help stop the flood of communism that seems to be engulfing us on this side of the world. It is past the eleventh hour, but if we all work with speed and intelligence, I firmly believe we can still save the East for democracy.

I bring this situation to the attention of the Committee, because my friend wants and needs help in Pakistan in combating the insidious influence of Soviet Russia. There is a chance this reduction in the committee figure will prohibit the proper expansion of our anti-communism programs throughout the world. This cut might harm our efforts when and where we need to go forward the most.

It seems to me that we are most unwise to cut these funds any further. There is already a 32-percent cut in this appropriation item. We know of the many millions of dollars Soviet Russia is spending to jam the Voice of America throughout the world. It would be tragic, in my humble judgment, for us in the House of Representatives at this eleventh hour to jam the Voice of America by slashing Voice of America funds more than the 32 percent already recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. America needs a louder and clearer Voice and we cannot obtain that result by this amendment.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the Russians are spending millions of dollars promoting their interests. Personally, I think American democracy and freedom is worth more than \$15,000,000.

(Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Crawford].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Clevenger amendment to reduce the appropriation. The gentleman from Texas referred to the great disbursements made for advertising by the tobacco people, the liquor interests, the Coca-Cola Co., the beer companies, and so forth. Those concerns spend their own money, they do a good job as they see it of appealing to the consumer, and they get dividends on the money spent. I protest against the cheap paltry dividends the American people have received, and those in my district in particular, for the tax dollars they have put into the State Department's Voice of America. If I had my way about it I would cut out the entire program as now carried on by the State Department and keep the appropriations withheld until a genuine American program was designed to go on the air.

Now, then, if you want to put a genuine Voice of America on the air which



represents the people of this country, the ideals and institutions for which we have fought and stood for 164 years, I will support it, but I will not support the cheap, dirty stuff that has gone out and against which members of this committee protest.

That is exactly the way I feel about it, and I have a lot of people in my district who will back me up on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a quote from the Soviet Home Service of Moscow. The men in the Kremlin, it appears, are not in favor of the Voice. They share with some of my good friends here on the floor the belief that the Voice should be curtailed if not completely silenced. Listen to this:

With the object of befuddling the brains of the peoples of Marshallized countries and of converting them into obedient tools of the criminal plans of the warmongers, United States ruling circles are striving, on the one hand, to flood these countries with reactionary man-hating propaganda, literature, films, and periodicals, propagating the present aggressive course of United States policy; and, on the other hand, they are insisting that the governments of Marshallized countries should in their turn develop and intensify the praising of American ideology and the American way of life.

I should also like to quote from the column of that great columnist Drew Pearson, of Tuesday, July 24, 1951:

#### VOICE AND OATIS LINKED

Reports from behind the iron curtain indicate that one reason for the seizure of AP Correspondent William Oatis by Czechoslovakia was that American propaganda through the Voice of America and radio free Europe is hurting.

When the Commies want to get something out of the U. S. A., their crudest but most successful technique is to seize an American citizen and hold him as a hostage until we come across with the ransom. The reported ransom in this case is to curtail the Voice and RFE, both really hurting the Commie government. Before Foreign Minister Clementis was purged, the Voice made a categorical prediction that he and eight other top Czechs would be arrested. For weeks the Voice pounded home this prediction, giving the exact names of the prospective victims. The Czechs listened but were skeptical. Then suddenly Clementis was arrested and with him four of the eight the Voice had named. All Czechoslovakia seethed at the news. The accuracy of the Voice was commented on everywhere, and its listening audience was doubled.

NOTE.—Despite the State Department's remarkable propaganda job, the budget of the Voice and other propaganda projects had been slashed to ribbons. Congressmen who have been doing the mutilation have been invited to come to the State Department briefing room and get the story (much of it confidential) of what the Department is doing. However, only two or three have bothered to get acquainted.

In heaven's name, Mr. Chairman, are we to play the Moscow game here on the very floor of the United States Congress?

I am for the Voice. If I needed any convincing of the effectiveness of its work, these wild protests coming from the Kremlin would do the job. Let the "galled jade wince." I am in favor of adding another prick to the spur.

(Mr. ANFUSO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] put his finger on the crux of the situation when he said that a great many people object to certain individuals in the State Department and are venting their wrath on this appropriation. For example I disagree thoroughly with the almost daily diatribes and arguments of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] that the cure for all the ills of this country and the world is a return to the gold standard, but I do not advocate the abolition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because his remarks appear in it. I have not heard anyone say what specific person in the Voice of America they would like to get rid of or what particular scripts they want to get rid of. There are probably some scripts that should be changed and some people perhaps should be replaced but you ought to indict the individual rather than the whole program.

There is another thing. There are a lot of things that are going on in the propaganda field that we cannot talk about. Right up here in the gallery sits a representative of the Russian press. If he is not there now he has the privilege by consent of the Members of this House to be there. Therefore I must say I have in this envelope certain confidential documents that the Voice of America has prepared and are putting out behind the iron curtain in conjunction with people who are fighting for freedom behind that iron curtain that I cannot explain on the floor because I do not want the Communists to know about it. But I am permitted and authorized to say that I can show them to any Member of this House who is interested. I think they are effective. Some Members have looked at them. All I ask is that we do not have any leaks like we did with the B-36 program when certain Members of Congress gave the Communists more information than all Stalin's spies. There are a lot of things that the Voice of America is doing that we have not discussed, and as someone has said here, it is hurting the Communist puppet governments. I was in Czechoslovakia about a year and a half ago and I know that some of the propaganda that America is putting out is hurting. It is the truth, and the truth always hurts, and I know that it is hurting those regimes behind the iron curtain because they do not want their people to know how people in America live.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, there is very little opposition to an effective Voice of America in these times of world crisis. I have heretofore spoken on this subject at great length. I think the Members know my position and my feelings, that we will never have an effective Voice of America until it is coordinated

and until we eliminate the duplication and competition which the Voice of America as we know it is facing today. We should have one strong coordinated Voice. All of these competing Voices of America should be brought together in order that our Voice will become stronger and more effective.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The trouble with the Voice of America is that it is not doing a job. That is the reason why many of us are terribly disturbed. Frankly, for my own part, I would not for a moment think of such a thing as cutting this item if the money were being spent effectively. But when we have such situations as Mr. Hulten, who was in charge of it, and who had failed for so long, and who moved out of being in charge, but is still on the payroll, and William T. Stone, whose name was in the paper in connection with the Senate investigation, and that type of folks, it disturbs me. Frankly, the whole picture is that they are putting out a lot of stuff. Reports come in to the State Department from our embassies indicating how little it is being heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the comments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] are correct, God help us, because in the struggle in which we are engaged today with the Soviets all over the world we certainly need propaganda warfare, and it is necessary that we prosecute such warfare relentlessly. Bullets alone will never kill an idea or a belief. Only a superior idea or belief can win.

As I walked into the Chamber the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] handed me some propaganda sheets the Russians are spreading throughout the world. Let me show them to you. This poster is an example of what the Russians are spreading throughout the Middle East. The picture on the left has the phrase, "We are transforming deserts into blooming lands." On the right it shows American bombers obviously going over Korea, and it states, "They are transforming cities and villages into deserts." Do you want no answer to these? Will you let these lies prevail because you refused funds? This amendment would give victory to the Soviets by default.

Here is another poster; one that is being spread throughout China and Korea. Translated, it says, "The American world order, the military adventures of the imperialists hold in store for them only catastrophe." This one is going all through the Far East. This one is going through the Middle East. If we are not meeting them through the Voice of America and our educational service, then, as I said before, God help us, for any victory we may win will be empty and short-lived.

The difficulty with the approach of the Members on the left side of the



aisle, it seems to me, is that although they profess to support the Voice of America, they want to cripple its effectiveness, in order to get at one or two gentlemen whom they dislike. Does it make sense to take funds away from an activity which they admit is vital? Of course it does not. You cannot breathe life into something by destroying the element which gives it life. You cannot revitalize an agency by denying its funds. You are making an appropriation now for the entire year. You are making an appropriation now to spread the American way of life and the American concepts of democracy throughout the entire world.

Mr. Chairman, war is brutal and tough; psychological warfare no less than any other type. You cannot waltz through a war. You need firepower—you need firepower for ideological warfare, as well as for active battle, and weapons creating firepower must be paid for. If you cut this appropriation it would have the same effect as though you had taken bullets and guns away from the soldiers who are fighting your battles on the war fronts of the world.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BENTSEN. The gentleman from Michigan in addressing his remarks to my talk was concerned with dividends. Although the gentleman from Michigan did not yield to me at the time, I should like to say to him that in the battle for the minds of men he can measure his dividends in gold star mothers if this program fails.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is certainly correct. I say to the House that this is an important vote. This is vital in maintaining the struggle against the Soviet throughout the world. We must carry it on through an effective means of propaganda, in order to supplement and assure total victory in our fight against the forces of oppression.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the thing about this proposition is just this: Unless we serve notice on the Voice of America by adopting this amendment that we want that place cleaned up and made effective, and the people put in charge of it who can do a job in supporting the United States of America, we will indeed be building an army of gold-star mothers. That is where our trouble is. We are not doing the job. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] on the efforts he has made. But we have to go further. We have to make them clean up and have a good Voice of America. God help us if we do not have the courage to meet this situation and tell those people that they must clean up and have an effective Voice. I was disappointed when the majority leader came here and produced a list of these prominent people who he said were members of the Advisory Committee. I talked with a member of the Advisory Committee a little while ago, who said he had not been called to a

meeting in a year. The editor of the Saturday Evening Post, who was on that committee, has never been called to a meeting, and he wrote just a little while ago just what he thought about the situation and the way it was not being carried on for the good of the American people to get across the message of where America stood. I want to see that done. I want to see somebody who has some knowledge of the psychology of the people to whom he is broadcasting doing the job. I want to see them putting something across. If we do not tell this fellow that he cannot go along in this way any longer, it is just too bad. That is all.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted and that we will make a move toward a real Voice of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I say that this committee has already served that notice to which he refers, when it cut this appropriation from \$115,000,000 to \$85,000,000. Let me point out this to you. In the marking up of this item of this bill, every single member of the subcommittee present, both majority and minority was in agreement with the exception of the gentleman from Ohio who now offers the amendment to cut the appropriation to \$70,000,000.

The gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and others who have spoken in support of the pending amendment have been opposed to having any Voice of America for a long time past.

I say to you definitely that if you adopt this amendment the radio broadcasting and the overseas missions of the Voice of America would have to be curtailed below the minimum program level considered essential by your committee. The six new languages approved by the committee could not be added to the broadcasting schedule. We would be cutting our radio broadcasts to Russia below the minimum requirement of 3 hours daily, or our 1½ hours to the European satellites, or our half-hour programs to such vital countries as India, Malaya, Indonesia, and Thailand. We must not allow our staffs overseas to fall below the present ratio of one American for every million and a half persons of the free world. The Kremlin has one propagandist for every 660 people in the world. If the \$70,000,000 proposal is accepted, it will mean that Russia's expenditure of over a billion dollars a year, not counting the money spent by the satellites and the native Communist parties, will give her a 15 to 1 fire-power advantage over us.

May I point out to you further that if you adopt this amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER] it would be possible to produce only one motion-picture program about every 6 weeks. I am confident that the Members of this House will look at this in a sane and sober manner and that they are not going to go along with this pro-

posed remedy for the patient's sore throat—a remedy that would cut off the patient's head.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Ohio but I must ask that the so-called Clevenger amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROONEY and Mr. CLEVENGER.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 136, noes 167.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Wood of Idaho: Page 15, line 25, before the period insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That funds appropriated herein shall not be available for any broadcast of any information about the United States until the radio script for such broadcast has been submitted to and approved by a committee of members of the Daughters of the American Revolution, appointed by the president general of such organization."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Idaho desire to be heard on the point or order?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will only hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is a limitation and not legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman completed his statement on the point of order?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Wood] has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair invites attention to the fact that the amendment definitely provides for certain things to be done and invites attention to a decision rendered by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] in which it is stated:

An amendment withholding expenditures of appropriations unless and until certain books were supplied free to the National Library for the Blind is ruled out of order.

The amendment very clearly contains legislation which is sought to be offered to an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

(Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)



Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some unanimity of opinion the Voice of America shall be permitted to continue. The whole question seems to be: With what?

The good sense and patriotism of the American people have been outraged, not only by the ineptness of so much of the program material but also because of the fact that at least a portion of it has been very definitely un-American, devoted to the thesis that America is not now an indissoluble constitutional Union of 48 States, but that it is a weak and afraid government, seeking to merge its fortunes into some illusory and fantastic world government.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to hitch our wagon to that kind of a star. In the first place, that kind of motive power is too erratic. It tends to pull this way and that as it is dominated by the dissonant voices of ethnic and religious majorities.

In the second place, our wagon has too much in it. It has the glorious record of 300 years of unparalleled success in working out the majority of our national aims. Our wagon not only carries these achievements; it carries the hopes of the world that it shall continue in just this form. We are a governmental light set upon a hill of accomplishment.

We certainly cannot submerge this kind of an America in the Sargasso sea of conflicting and always inferior mongrel and selfish aims of peoples who have yet to demonstrate they understand one jot or one tittle of what we are supposedly trying to carry to them. Freedom cannot be carried to a people in a paper bag. It is a plant of slow growth, which must first be implanted in the soul by Almighty God.

The Voice should leave the realm of mirages and abstractions and tell the story of America as she is. To that end my amendment leaves the editing of the program material used by the voice to the DAR, which is one of several organizations which may yet be depended upon to blow the trumpet of America without the fuzzy overtones of a hybrid and un-American ideology, deeply resented by the majority of our people. If my amendment be adopted, we need have no further fears as to what kind of a message shall be beamed out to the world. The DAR is nonpartisan and deeply patriotic. Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment may be adopted.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Page 15, following line 25, insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"There is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

"The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of ascertaining the means by which the national interest may best be protected and served in time of peace by the conduct of international information services and in time of war or threat

of war by a civilian psychological warfare agency.

"The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

"There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$50,000 for the purposes of this proviso."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment on the ground that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House. However, since this amendment is offered by the charming gentlewoman from Massachusetts, I reserve the point of order so that we might all hear her remarks which I know will be utterly delightful.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that very much. I would like to bring this amendment to the attention of the House again. I have had it in the form of a resolution before the Rules Committee for a great many months.

I have heard a great deal of approval expressed for this plan, beginning with the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Allen, now Ambassador to Belgrade, I understand, by Mr. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of Voice of America; and other public-relations officials, as well as by Members of the House. I spoke to the Speaker in the closing days of the last session of the Congress, and I hope that I have his approval and his interest in it.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, after hearing all the debate on the Voice of America for several years, we are acting as a perfectly futile body and that the State Department is practically futile in its efforts to have an effective Voice of America. A commission of Members of Congress constantly on the watch would be most constructive and would be a great protection to America.

Mr. Chairman, we have too many voices as it is.

There should be one Voice of America for the United States—not several, such as ECA, point 4, Voice of Freedom, and the commercial broadcasts.

There should be a continuing legislative examination of psychological warfare practices and policies, such as was proposed in my resolution introduced in this Eighty-second Congress and in the proposed amendment.

There should be an immediate appraisal of successful and unsuccessful programs—radio, press, pamphlets, motion

pictures, and so forth—as employed in all areas. This should be done with a view toward abandoning unsuccessful programs and stepping up successful ones.

Radio Washington should be the name source of United States of America official broadcasts.

There should be a report to the people. United States commercial radio and television corporations would be pleased to cooperate. This report, made weekly, would say what is being said about us by other nations and say what we are replying to those other nations through the Voice of America. I have a letter from Secretary of State Barrett written last year approving that.

Again I say, Mr. Chairman, that instead of having the Voice of America we should have a Radio Washington. Every country in the world knows Washington, knows that it is the seat of our Government, and they would pay attention to what goes out over Radio Washington. They pay attention to Radio Rome, to Radio Paris, and BBS, which is really Radio London. Today no country pays any attention, so far as I can tell, to the Voice of America. They feel it is still the old commercial voice that was started years ago and not a government voice.

I earnestly hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will assist in having this commission created. Since the Democrats are in control, there would be more Democrats on the commission than Republicans, and it should be nonpartisan. It would work from month to month and year to year.

We all know of the effective work done by Admiral Zacharias in his radio broadcasts to Japan during World War II. It was conceded by many Japanese that the atom bomb was not needed, and that Admiral Zacharias' broadcast brought the Japanese to their senses.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that you will assist me in getting this resolution passed later.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, the gentlewoman knows that this is not the proper forum for the discussion of her proposed legislation. This is legislation that should be handled by the proper legislative committee of the House. I do not express an opinion one way or the other, but it is my duty to make the point of order against her proposed amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I realize that, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate your allowing me to speak at some length on it, and I do think that this is the time to bring it to the attention of the House. If I had felt that we had gotten anywhere with the Voice of America, I would not be so insistent in having this resolution passed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Instead of having a commission, how would it be if we had MacArthur speak for America?



What does the gentlewoman think about that?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Well, he is always speaking for America. Many people feel he is the voice of America and would like to have him elected President of the United States. The Commission provided for in my amendment is a thing that would go on for years and years. I hope we will have a Radio Washington for all times.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He has not faded away yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Why not the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, I have not the conceit that some other Members have.

Mr. McCORMACK. I asked the gentlewoman and not the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman knows my answer to that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentlewoman and I are in agreement; I assume that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Massachusetts desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will not take up any more time of the House. The Members all know what the resolution provides. I realize the amendment is out of order, but time and time again the House has passed legislation that was out of order in an appropriation bill. This is nothing new.

Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts has offered an amendment which has been reported, and the gentleman from New York makes a point of order against it. The Chair understood the gentlewoman from Massachusetts to concede the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

(Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce, unless there are other amendments to the provision which has been under consideration, that on yesterday the Clerk had read down to and including line 6, page 57, so the Clerk will now read at that point.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United

States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the majority might have a copy of this so-called secret weapon of the Republican Party. I have asked for it now three or four times of the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Just as a matter of personal privilege, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has a copy of it. I think he has forgotten.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not have a copy, I insist.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 58, following line 14, add a new section to be numbered 109:

"None of the money appropriated in title I of this act shall be paid to the head of any executive department who, within a period of 5 years preceding his appointment, was a partner in, or a member of a professional firm which derived any part of its income from representing, or acting for a foreign government, or who, acting as an individual, derived income from such representation, unless hereafter appointed or reappointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to make the point of order against this proposed amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House.

I direct the Chair's attention to Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, volume 7, section 1632, which reads as follows:

An amendment forbidding expenditure of an appropriation unless action contrary to existing law is taken is legislation and is not in order as a limitation.

An amendment may not, under guise of limitation, provide affirmative legislation on an appropriation bill.

On June 4, 1910, the sundry civil appropriation bill was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, when Mr. N. E. Kendall, of Iowa, offered an amendment providing a new section as follows:

"No money appropriated herein shall be expended for any work performed under contract unless such contract shall contain a stipulation that no laborer or mechanic doing any part of the same, under the employ of any contractor or subcontractor contracting for the performance of any part of said work, shall be required or permitted to labor more than 8 hours on said work in any one calendar day."

Mr. James A. Tawney, of Minnesota, made the point of order that the amendment was not a limitation but a change of existing law.

The Chairman ruled:

"The rule is well settled that a limitation on an appropriation is in order. It is also well settled that an amendment in the form of a limitation which changes existing law is not in order. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is that—

"No money appropriated herein shall be expended for any work performed under contract unless such contract shall contain a stipulation that no laborer or mechanic doing any part of the same, under the employ of any contractor or subcontractor contracting for the performance of any part of said work, shall be required or permitted to labor more than 8 hours on said work in any one calendar day."

"In the first place, there are various appropriations in this bill for the purpose of carrying out contracts. These contracts under existing law do not and cannot contain the stipulation named in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. And if this amendment should prevail, no portion of the money appropriated under this bill for the carrying out of contracts could be expended for that purpose, because those contracts do not contain the stipulation which the gentleman proposes, unless it be held that this law writes into these contracts the stipulation not contained in the contracts themselves. If it be held that the law writes into the contract a stipulation not now in the contract, that would be clearly not only a change of law but a change, possibly, of the contract.

"Under the existing law, also, the department has the authority in reference to making these contracts to leave out such a stipulation as is now provided; and the test, after all, in reference to limitation is whether, when the provision is made under limitation, the officers entrusted with the expenditure of the appropriation may refuse to expend it, or whether they are required to expend it under changed conditions; whether they must construe the limitation as a change of law, and it is perfectly clear that if this amendment prevails that, at least as to all contracts hereafter, the department of the Government expending this appropriation would take this as a legislative declaration that this stipulation must be in the contract and not a mere limitation of discretion on their part for the expenditure of the money. For both reasons the Chair sustains the point of order."

Mr. Chairman, I also call attention to section 1634 of the same volume of Cannon's Precedents, which holds that—

Professed limitations not to become effective "unless" or "until" affirmative action was taken were held to be out of order in an appropriation bill.



An amendment withholding expenditure of appropriations "unless" and "until" certain books were supplied free to the National Library for the Blind was ruled out of order.

I also direct the Chair's attention to section 1640 of the same volume of Cannon's Precedents, which holds that—

Provision that no appropriation provided in the bill be available for any national park "unless" park concessions were granted to highest bidder therefor was held to be legislation and not in order on an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is out of order for the reasons just cited.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do, briefly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I take it for granted that the part of the amendment to which the gentleman from New York takes exception and makes a point of order against is in the last 13 words, beginning with the word "unless"; and since he has cited the authorities, and since the Chair has already ruled on a similar point of order to another amendment, I will concede the point of order, and offer another amendment which I have at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, of course the author of the amendment, I presume, has the right to concede the point of order, insofar as he is concerned, but it strikes me that there is a substantial difference between the present amendment and the one which was cited from the precedents. In that case a new law would be required—an 8-hour law. The present amendment in the part following the word "unless" merely recites what is existing law and in our Constitution, and that is that if someone is appointed or reappointed and confirmed by the other body, he then has the office. Therefore, there is a very valid and vital distinction between the amendment now pending and the amendment in the citations given by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. Language similar to the present amendment was involved in the Lovett case which went to the Supreme Court and there was no objection to the language all the way up to the Supreme Court.

The provision following the word "unless" merely recites what is existing law under the Constitution, to wit, the appointment by the President of an officer and his confirmation by the Senate. No additional duties are required. There is a great deal of difference between that and the requirement of the amendment cited from the precedents that an 8-hour law be enacted before the amendment could become effective.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then, Mr. Chairman, if I may do so, I will not concede the point of order, so that the Chair may rule on it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The gentleman from California has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it includes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair has listened to the argument presented and has followed the precedents cited by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], and is of the opinion that the gentleman has correctly stated the precedents appearing in section 1632 of Cannon's Precedents.

The Chair would invite attention to the fact that that decision was made by one of the most accomplished legislators and one of the greatest parliamentarians who ever served in this body, the Honorable James R. Mann, of Illinois.

The gentleman also cites section 1634 of Cannon's Precedents, to which the Chair referred a moment ago in passing upon a point of order made on a previous amendment offered.

In response to the observation made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], the Chair thinks he should state that the Chair does not know any provision of law requiring the President of the United States to submit the name of one of his Cabinet officers to the Senate for confirmation after that Cabinet officer has been appointed and confirmed by the Senate and is now acting and serving.

The Chair invites attention to the last part of the amendment presented: "Unless hereafter appointed or reappointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate." That would clearly impose a duty upon the President of the United States to reappoint a Cabinet officer and submit the name of that appointee to the Senate for confirmation. Therefore, that would clearly provide legislation on an appropriation bill, in violation of the rules of the House, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 58, following line 14, add a new section to be numbered section 602:

"None of the money appropriated in this act shall be paid to the head of any executive department who, within a period of 5 years preceding his appointment, was a partner in, or a member of, a professional firm which derived any part of its income from representing, or acting for, a foreign government, or who, acting as an individual, derived income from such representation."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, and I will reserve the point of order at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to establish a principle. It is that a Cabinet officer, like Caesar's wife, should be above suspicion.

The United States is going through what may well turn out to be the most serious and critical period in its history. The future of this Nation will depend on the results of decisions and negotiations now being made. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the suspicion of influence or obligation should fall upon the principal negotiator, or the head of the policy-making department.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to brush from your mind any of the rumors, the conjectures, the misstatements, the clever cartoons, the propaganda, or even the fishing expeditions of the State Department itself. At no time has my suggested amendment ever included more than 2 or 3 of the names on the list of 37 released by the State Department. At no time has it said that anyone doing business with, or selling to, a foreign nation, should be subject to the principle involved. It has referred only to men and women, never more than three or four in number, who held policy-making positions, and who had, within a few years, represented a foreign government for a fee. This is the principle; the avoidance of suspicion of influence, or obligation.

If you wish to ask me if I would like the amendment to be widened, I would be constrained to say "Yes." Being a Republican or a Democrat has nothing to do with it. The issue is, in simple language, being an American. At the moment, the discussion revolves around one man. He is the head of the executive department which presently is making American policy in Europe, in Asia, in Iran, in South America.

It is an amendment which can be applied, should similar circumstances exist, to the head of any executive agency of the Government.

The language is carefully chosen. It is the language used in the act through which the Congress increased the salaries of various top-flight executives. If we can raise a man's pay by the language, we can require him to meet the conditions serving the safety of the Nation.

The present Secretary of State testified on January 13, 1949—hearings, Senate Foreign Relations Committee—that he left the law office of Justice Brandeis to join the law firm of which, according to his own testimony, he was still a member in 1949. Actually, a shortened timetable of his associations would be as follows:

Joined firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, 1921. Left firm May 1933 to become Under Secretary of the Treasury. Returned to the practice of law November 16, 1933, under the firm name, Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson, Shorb. Firm name changed January 1, 1934. Left firm January 31, 1941.



Assistant Secretary of State, beginning February 1, 1941.

Under Secretary of State, from August 16, 1945, to June 30, 1947.

Returned to the same law firm July 1, 1947, until January 18, 1949.

Became Secretary of State January 18, 1949.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having asked you to observe that list of dates, I ask you now to observe with great care the following dates, in which the same law firm, or members of that firm, represented, for pay, foreign nations. This to me is very important.

Let me first quote two statements of the Secretary of State himself. I call him as my witness in support of my amendment. Said the Secretary:

My name was not dropped from the title of the firm. It was dropped from the list of partners who were connected with the firm. The name and style of the firm remained the same.

Do you suppose, Mr. Chairman, that a foreign nation, seeing the name of the Secretary of State or the Under Secretary, then in office, in the firm name of a Washington law firm, that this fact would have any influence in the selection of a law firm to represent that nation in profitable negotiations with the United States Government?

And again:

I had no further connection with (this law firm) until I returned to private practice on July 1, 1947.

Please note: Upon his return to private practice in 1947 the Secretary did have a financial connection with the law firm and this continued until January 18, 1949, 3 days before he became Secretary of State.

The Secretary was asked if there was any chance for public misunderstanding. This is the point, Mr. Chairman, of my amendment. His reply was frank and honest. I quote:

I should think there might very easily be, and it will be my recommendation to my partners that they would please me very much, and I think serve themselves, by dropping my name from the style of the firm.

I now come, Mr. Chairman, to the side of the picture which creates the suspicion of influence—the firm's business with foreign governments. Shall I ask you again, Mr. Chairman, if you are willing to assure me that the fact that the Secretary of State was in and out of a law firm at intervals had no connection with this business, or with its going to that firm?

March 1946, the Government of Iran retained the law firm to represent it in proceedings before the Security Council, which grew out of a complaint filed against Iran by the Soviet Union. The fee was \$25,000. All these figures and facts are from the Senate hearings and from other factual records.

In July 1941 the firm was retained by the Danish Ambassador. The present Secretary of State was then the Assistant Secretary of State.

In December 1945 one of the members of the firm was retained to represent the owners of nine Finnish ships. The present Secretary was then Under Secretary.

This case, not being that of representing the Government itself, does not fall under my principle.

On February 8, 1947, the firm was retained by the Greek Government, to advise in proceedings before the United Nations. The present Secretary was then Under Secretary.

In December 1946 the firm was retained by the Royal Swedish Air Board, in connection with the purchases of aircraft made in this country. The present Secretary was then the Under Secretary.

In November 1947 the firm was retained by the Republic of Colombia. The present Secretary was then back in the firm.

The most interesting example of representation was the deal over the loans to Poland. This was in October 1945. The firm was retained by the Polish Supply Mission. The present Secretary was then Under Secretary. The loan was granted, totaling \$90,000,000. The firm's fee was \$50,175. The Ambassador to Poland, Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane, opposed the granting of the loan. I refer you to his book, *I Saw Poland Betrayed*, at page 237. Only after President Truman, in March 1947, made a strong statement of disapproval of the activities of the Polish Government was the representation dissolved.

There is one interesting omission in the testimony before the Senate committee from which I am quoting. The Secretary undoubtedly forgot to mention, unless my memory is in error, that this loan was handled for the firm by Mr. Donald Hiss.

Is not this enough, Mr. Chairman? Is there any lawyer here, familiar with the code of ethics of his high calling, who does that think that, innocent as each individual case may be, it would be well for the present Secretary of State to step out and to protect the United States, in its present negotiations, and those impending, from even the faintest breath of suspicion of interest or influence or obligation?

Is there any judge who, under similar circumstances, would not disqualify himself? He might be an honest and capable judge, but the dignity of his profession and the protection of its integrity would be a decisive factor in his unwillingness to invite misunderstanding or suspicion.

There is one other feature of this curious and interesting case, but I shall discuss that separately on another day. I do not have time now. This is the question of dual citizenship, as it is called, under international law. The present Secretary of State is an American citizen. He is, unless he himself has taken affirmative action to change this status, also a subject of Great Britain. I have seen no record of this required renunciation which must be taken after he has attained maturity. Dual citizenship is a curious status. It would enable anyone falling under it to ask for a passport from either the United States or from Great Britain. I have known of people who have gone abroad, sometimes with one passport, sometimes with the other. In this case it does not in any way challenge the Secretary's American

citizenship, it only adds to the necessity of having a head of this executive department who can under no circumstances, and for no reason, be suspected of being influenced by another nation in negotiations in which, as I said, the future of the United States may well depend.

It is better to stand on principle than to yield the future of the United States to political expediency.

I leave to others the question of the Secretary's competence in the administration of the office he now holds. I confine myself to the principle of influence and obligation.

The amendment is simple:

On page 58, following line 14, add a new section, to be numbered 6:

"None of the money appropriated in title I of this act shall be paid to the head of any executive department who, within 5 years preceding his appointment, was a partner in, or a member of a professional firm which derived part of its income from representing, or acting for a foreign government, or who, acting as an individual, derived income from such representation, unless hereafter appointed or reappointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate."

Personally, and aside from this amendment, I think we might well consider the record of the State Department under the present Secretary. Do you agree with a policy which told Russia we would not defend Korea and then, when the Russians took us at our word, sent our men, unprepared, into battle, on Korea?

It is a policy which deprived us, because of personal antagonism, of the brilliant services of General MacArthur. Can you imagine General MacArthur letting even the State Department get him into a position where the cease-fire negotiations could be used for Communist propaganda?

Our State Department, largely due to the present Secretary of State, has lost us the friendship and support of China. Today, China, a member of the UN and an ally who fought Red Russia for years before we got into the Japanese conflict, is not being invited to the negotiations over the peace treaty with Japan.

Are you willing to leave Iran, and the possibilities of world war III, to the same influences? Do you want to retain the Russian influences in the Department?

Do you want the imperialistic policies of England to control, or the liberty-determining policies of our own Constitution, and of our own struggle for liberty?

It has been said on this floor, and in the newspapers, that the State Department, under the present Secretary, is the greatest single influence in Washington. It has been said that it controls the White House thinking, and that its influence is strong in the Democratic Party. We know that it influences the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. We are about to see today if it influences the House of Representatives. The Republican Party has twice already passed resolutions saying the people of the United States have lost confidence in the present Secretary of State and that he should resign or be removed.



That is the subject of the amendment, the unfortunate result to the Nation of a loss of confidence. The amendment is very simple. You have heard it read.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. The gentleman feels this amendment should apply to all Cabinet officials?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I said I thought it could. In this bill it applies to three.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Why should not the amendment apply to Members of Congress who may have represented certain interests, then are elected to Congress, or to Members of Congress who have served here for some time and then go out to represent private interests and come on the floor of the Congress of the United States and lobby?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I can answer that very quickly. The gentleman knows I am very much in favor of the code of ethics which was developed by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT]. That would be covered by that.

Another answer is that every two years Members of Congress go back to the people and if the people are not satisfied, we do not come back to the next session. We are not the determining factor, without such control, over a policy which may well determine the future history of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. It would occur to me that we ought to have a bill dealing with the ethical conduct of all public officials including Members of Congress as well as those appointed by the President of the United States?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am afraid right now the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] would make a point of order against such an amendment if added to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment starts out under the guise of a limitation, "No money in this appropriation shall be paid," and so forth. A limitation, as I understand it, cannot impose any more duties upon an official, any affirmative duties, any additional duties, that do not presently exist by law.

Let us see what additional duties this amendment imposes upon someone. It does not state here, but someone has to carry out the provisions of this amendment if it were held to be in order and it was adopted. "Who in a period of 5 years preceding his appointment." Who is going to determine the 5-year period? Somebody has got to say. That is an additional duty and responsibility resting upon somebody. That is legislation. "Was a partner in." Somebody has to pass on that. That imposes additional

duties upon somebody. "Or a member of a professional firm which derived any part of its income from representing, or acting for a foreign government." That imposes additional duties upon some one, and that duty is not imposed upon anybody by law now. There is no organic law now relating to it. "Or who, acting as an individual, derived income from such representation." There are many firms where men may be partners in one thing and in one case, and not partners in another. Somebody has to determine all of these factors.

Mr. Chairman, under the guise of a limitation I respectfully submit that the proposed amendment constitutes pure legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I am sure that all the information necessary was necessarily obtained before the appointment was made. It all appears, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, in the Senate hearings.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wish to speak very briefly to the point of order only to point out the absurdity of the argument made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. If his argument is logically followed through it would not be possible for the Congress to make any appropriation, because every appropriation that we make requires that someone take some action to determine that a condition or situation exists before the money appropriated can be had or used. For example, if we make an appropriation for the armed services, someone has to certify the individuals who are entitled to receive it. Someone must take action to create the obligation which justifies the expenditure. What I say with reference to this appropriation is true with reference to every appropriation bill. Every appropriation requires something be done before the money becomes available, an action which is incidental rather than legislative.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, the argument as presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts puts the House in this position if it is carried through to its logical conclusion. If the House, in passing upon the appropriation for the Office of Secretary of State, is of the opinion that we should not in the interest of our country have that Secretary of State, then we have one of two choices: to provide no money whatever or take him. I have made inquiry in regard to the amount of money received by Dean Acheson's law firm in claims against United States for foreign countries. It covered the period from the time that our present Secretary of State brought Donald Hiss into that law office, up to but not including this

year the total fees for representing foreign countries is over \$450,000, not including advance costs—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wants to hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. WERDEL. I am speaking to the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I make this point of order. I am of the opinion, and I believe many Members of the House are, that we should not have the present Secretary of State—

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is not on the point of order. Unless the gentleman wants to discuss the point of order, the Chair will not hear the gentleman.

Mr. WERDEL. If the Chair will bear with me and let me finish, if the Chair sustains this point of order, he then puts us in this position, that if the House is of the frame of mind that we do not have a Secretary of State to the interest of our country, the only thing we can do is to shut off the whole amount of this appropriation for the Department of State.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not at all applicable to the question now pending before the House.

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from California has offered an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from New York has made a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not a proper limitation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has examined the amendment with some degree of care, and would invite attention to the fact that it provides:

None of the money appropriated in title I of this act shall be paid to the head of any executive department who, within a period of 5 years preceding his appointment, was a partner in, or a member of a professional firm which derived any part of its income from representing, or acting for a foreign government, or who, acting as an individual, derived income from such representation.

It should be clear that almost any limitation must necessarily require some action on the part of somebody. One of the classic illustrations given on many occasions by the distinguished parliamentarian to whom the Chair made reference a few moments ago, Hon. James R. Mann, of Illinois, was that if a provision states that "no part of this appropriation shall be paid to a red-headed man," somebody will have to find that red-headed man and determine whether his hair is red; therefore, it would appear that in any instance where a limitation is sought to be imposed there must be some activity contemplated or some effort exerted by somebody to carry out the provisions of the limitation.

The Chair would invite attention to section 1593 of Cannon's Precedents, and reads the syllabus:

A provision that no part of an appropriation be used for payment of any employee not appointed through the civil service was held to be a limitation and in order on an appropriation bill.

That decision was on December 3, 1922.



The Chair is of the opinion that that decision is applicable to the pending question raised by the point of order made by the gentleman from New York. It would appear that the over-all and controlling element of the pending amendment is a limitation on an appropriation bill. It is entirely negative in character, and does not affirmatively impose any additional duties upon anybody.

Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MACK of Washington moves that the committee rise and report to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, most of the time on most issues I agree and vote with the Republicans. I do this partly because of party loyalty but mostly because I regard the Republican position on most matters to be the better one.

However, sometimes I support and vote with the Democrats. Today, I agree with those Democrats who are urging a strong bipartisan foreign policy. I believe in a strong bipartisan foreign policy, and I agree with the Democrats who want that kind of a policy.

Most of all I agree with those Democrats who believe the first plank and cornerstone of any effective bipartisan foreign policy is the obtaining of a new Secretary of State.

I find many of the Democratic leaders in Congress agree with me that the present Secretary of State should be dismissed and a new Secretary of State appointed in his place. These Democrats and I all hold this would promote national unity and thereby increase our national strength.

For example, I read in the Washington Post of August 4, 1950, a news item which said:

Representative PRIEST, according to the AP, said in Nashville, Tenn., Tuesday that he felt Acheson and Johnson should be replaced in the interest of national unity.

"I am using my influence toward that end," he said.

He added, "I feel that above everything else today we need unity of spirit and purpose. In the interest of a completely unified effort in the task ahead of us, I feel that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State should be replaced."

I regard the gentleman from Tennessee, the majority whip, as one of the ablest, most patriotic and likable Members of the House. When he says the interest of national unity will be served by the removal of Mr. Acheson, I agree with him, and I am willing to be of what assistance I can to him when he says he is using his influence to get Mr. Acheson removed.

The article also carried the names of several Democratic Senators whom Newsman Wilson claimed had asked Acheson's firing.

This article of newsman Wilson probably was carried by many hundreds of American newspapers from coast to coast since the United Press serves many hundreds of dailies with its news service.

Also, I have found signed articles in the Washington Times-Herald on May 7, 1951, by News Reporter Walter Trohan and on May 18, 1951, by Reporter Willard Edwards both of which asserted that Democratic top leaders of the Congress from both its houses went to the White House to bring up the matter of Acheson's removal. The Edwards article says that when one of these top Democratic leaders brought up the matter of Acheson's dismissal that "the President brushed it aside."

Arthur Sears Henning writing in the Washington Times-Herald on May 21, 1951, only 60 days ago, said:

Two Democratic leaders swelled the anti-Acheson chorus over the week end. Representative PRIEST, of Tennessee, Democratic whip in the House, said that the resignation of Acheson "would contribute to unity in the country and in Congress." Representative GORE, also of Tennessee, generally an administration supporter, said that "we cannot have unity and leadership while Dean Acheson remains as Secretary of State."

The question is not whether Secretary Acheson is a patriotic man. It is not whether he is an honest man. It is not whether he is a kindly and courteous man.

The vital question is, "Has Mr. Acheson, as Secretary of State, done a good job in defeating the spread of our enemy, communism?"

We must look to the record to find the answer to that question. Twelve years ago the State Department had only 5,000 employees. Today it has almost 29,000.

Twelve years ago, in 1938, the State Department was spending only \$19,600,000 in a year. For the coming year, Secretary Acheson has asked a budget of more than \$283,000,000, an almost fifteenfold increase over 1938.

Also, since 1939 our Government has given away to foreign nations in gifts and grants more than \$101,000,000,000. Much of this was done under Mr. Acheson's leadership. With all this vast increase in personnel and in dollars expended he was supposed to stop the spread of communism. Did he do it? The answer is that the Russian Communists had 179,000,000 people under their domination 6 years ago and today have 790,000,000 under their domination.

The record reveals that the State Department under Mr. Acheson has failed utterly and completely in checking the spread of communism.

If a football team loses game after game, season after season, the thing to do is to get a new coach. If a business goes into the red ink further and further, year after year, the thing for the directors to do is get a new manager. When our State Department, even with vastly increased expenditures, constantly loses ground in the fight against Russian communism, it seems to me that common sense dictates we should get a new Secretary of State.

I noted a news article in the Washington Times-Herald in its issue of August 4, 1950, referring to Mr. PRIEST's effort to get Mr. Acheson dismissed as Secretary of State, which said:

The President made this statement at his weekly news conference when told by a reporter that Representative PRIEST, Democrat,

of Tennessee, had called for both Secretaries [Johnson and Acheson] to resign in view of developments in Korea. Mr. Truman said sharply that PRIEST, as Democratic Party whip in the House, had no business making a statement of that kind.

Despite the President's condemnation of the majority whip, I still think that my friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is right, and in the interest of national unity, I will do what I can to assist Mr. PRIEST in getting Mr. Acheson out of office.

But the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is not the only Democrat who thinks Mr. Acheson, in the interest of national unity, should be dismissed as Secretary of State.

The Washington Times-Herald of May 3, 1951, less than 90 days ago, carried an article which, in part, said:

Representative Cox, Democrat, of Georgia, said he would support any drive to force Acheson out. So did Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi.

This Times-Herald article of May 3, 1951, quoted the gentleman from Georgia, Representative Cox, as having said:

This would cut the ground from under him [Acheson], and he will have to quit or President Truman will have to fire him.

In an article written by Lyle C. Wilson, of the United Press, one of America's greatest news-gathering agencies, and which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald May 29, 1951, less than 60 days ago, Newspaperman Wilson said:

Columnist Thomas Stokes has been consistently friendly to the Roosevelt-Truman administration. Stokes now reports that \* \* \* Speaker RAYBURN, of Texas \* \* \* and House Democratic Leader McCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and the Democratic House whip are among those who have sought Acheson's ouster.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, Mr. Stokes made an incorrect statement. It is not a quotation, but simply an incorrect statement.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I accept the gentleman's word.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is just an incorrect statement.

(Mr. STOCKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to state at this time my endorsement of the action taken by the House when the amendment which would have cut \$20,000 from the funds provided for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission was rejected. This is a very important item of this bill, and I hope it can be retained throughout the course of the bill through the Congress without cut in funds. This item is of vital importance to the American tuna industry which is now the most valuable fishery in the United States.

I am advised that the proposed appropriation of \$50,000 barely would support a skeleton staff with little equipment at the United States headquarters in San Diego, Calif., and would eliminate any



possibility of establishing the field laboratory at Puntarenas which has been assured Costa Rica. It would be impossible to carry out any of the field work necessary to begin the solution of the bait and other supply problems. If the Congress finds it impossible under present conditions to supply the full amount of funds requested for proper handling of this critical food and international relations problem, then I urge that we provide at least sufficient funds to meet our minimum obligation with Costa Rica. The appropriation should be sufficient to at least enable the Commission to get under way with a small staff, establish a field station at Puntarenas, and carry out the minimum amount of field work required to begin solution of the bait problem.

I am advised that at least \$100,000 would be required to cover the necessary skeleton staff and minimum equipment for the work and station at San Diego, Calif., and to cover the field station and the gear and boat services to begin the bait work in Costa Rica waters, and I urge that this entire amount be made available.

In 1950, over 400,000,000 pounds of tuna were landed by American fishermen and this was processed into canned tuna and byproducts having a wholesale value of \$125,000,000. The industry gives direct employment to many thousands of fishermen and cannery workers, not to mention the related industries that service this huge fleet. In addition to the large vessels that engage in the fishery all the year around, there are about 2,500 smaller boats that fish for tuna during a part of the year, when they can no longer fish for salmon or other fish. This provides year-round employment for both fishermen and cannery workers. Investment in tuna vessels and shore establishments is in the vicinity of \$125,000,000.

In 1950 the American tuna industry established new records of production for the fifth consecutive year—and consumption kept pace with production. Any threat to the continuing welfare and growth of this industry is a threat to an important high-protein, low-cost food resource. As food prices mount, canned tuna becomes increasingly essential to our national diet.

The cost of conducting the full scale investigation amounts annually to only about three-tenths of 1 percent of the value of the product. That does not seem a high rate to pay to insure continued production.

Most of the tuna is taken by bait boats. This type of fishing is completely dependent on availability of live bait which is thrown out to attract the tuna. The bait fish are found in the territorial waters of the Latin American countries of the tropical Pacific. They cannot successfully be transported from United States waters.

The bait situation gives rise to some of our most critical international fishery problems, that can only be settled between governments. The people of the Latin-American countries have seen this huge fleet of United States vessels fishing at their doorsteps, harvesting this

valuable resource of the high seas. They are not now able to participate in the tuna fishery themselves, but they hope one day to be able to do so. They are fearful that the United States will exhaust the resource before that day comes. They are fearful, too, that the fishermen will exhaust the bait resource which is a valuable source of revenue to these nations. Tuna fishermen pay annually some two and one-half to three million dollars, in licenses and fees, for the privilege of taking bait from the territorial waters of countries south of the United States.

Such information as we now have indicates that these fears are not well-founded, but not enough scientific evidence is available to prove the case or convince our neighbors. As a result of these apprehensions of our Latin American neighbors, the tuna fleet frequently operates under restrictive conditions that are not conducive either to efficient production or to good relations. License fees and fishing regulations have been changed often and radically, sometimes with very little notice or none at all. Taking of bait during certain seasons has been prohibited. These measures, promulgated in the name of conservation, are taken without factual information and hence are not in fact protecting the stocks.

This situation has created irritations and tensions resulting in needless friction. If allowed to continue, they constitute a very real threat to the continued success of the industry.

The Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission was established by treaty to carry on scientific studies which will provide the information necessary to determine the effect of the fishery upon the stocks of tuna and tuna bait. This can only be done by an international body in which all the affected nations have an equal voice. Our Latin-American neighbors will have confidence in the results of the investigations of the Commission because they will help guide its policies and will participate in its work. That confidence and the resulting solution of the problems could never be achieved by unilateral action, either on the part of the tuna industry or the United States Government.

The tuna convention was approved by the United States and was duly ratified by the Senate. The Congress passed the implementing legislation without a dissenting vote.

The Government of Costa Rica has entered into this agreement with the United States in good faith and has hailed the establishment of the Commission as an earnest of our desire and intention to work out our problems with our Latin-American neighbors and eliminate causes of friction on a fair and factual basis. Costa Rica has invited the other affected nations to join in this cooperative project, and we have reason to believe they will, provided the Commission shows vigor, intelligence, and cooperativeness in attacking the problems which are causing distrust and friction.

At this critical time in the establishment of the Commission and its work,

failure of the United States to provide funds adequate to enable the Commission to undertake at least its minimum commitments surely would be looked upon as an act of bad faith on the part of the United States. Not only would the work which has so far been done be wasted, but we would take upon ourselves a measure of ill will which would set us back in our relations with our neighbors further than before these negotiations were begun. Such a failure would practically eliminate any possibility of resuming this line of approach for a long time to come.

If the Congress did not desire to see this important work undertaken, it should have refused to ratify the convention and enact the implementing legislation in the beginning, rather than make it ineffective by permitting only a starvation diet now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the motion will be defeated, and yield back the balance of my time.

(Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for this amendment to forbid any appropriations to the State Department until Dean Acheson is removed from his office of Secretary of State only after a great deal of thought.

It is not the prerogative of the House of Representatives to select or to remove a Cabinet officer, particularly the man who, by tradition, is the principal adviser to a President. But there comes a time in the life of a nation when unusual events require unusual actions.

Never in history has come such a public demand from all over the United States for the removal of any one man from office. I do not need to tell you this. Your mail, your telephone calls, and personal visits from your constituents have brought the same clamor to your offices.

Why has this situation come about? What has brought on this unprecedented demand? This demand from the people themselves?

It is loss of confidence in the man who has guided our foreign policy where after five short years we not only stand on the brink of war—we are in war—a war in Korea in which the casualties amount to more casualties than we suffered in a full year in World War II. A war called a "police action," which the President, on the advice of his Secretary of State, had no plans of ending except in a stalemate—an act of appeasement itself—and a refusal to permit our military leaders to use their best military judgment. This, in spite of the fact that 90 percent of the troops involved are our own men; that our casualties amount to over 100 percent of the total men contributed by our so-called allies, except Korea.

Who is this man, Dean Acheson, who holds the fate of our country in his hands?

He is the man, who as Secretary of State, refused to turn his back on Alger



Hiss, the convicted perjurer, who was his confidant and aide.

He is the man who insisted there were no Communists in the State Department and who now belatedly has called for the investigation and suspension of some of his top aides years after he had been informed of their machinations.

He is the man who is willing to risk war and fight Communists on one side of the globe but turns a soft answer to them on the other side of the world while our men are fighting and dying.

He is the man, who without precedent in history, has captured the mind of the President so that today he is the most powerful man in the country.

What is Dean Acheson's background? Who is he?

This man who became our fiftieth Secretary of State was born of British parentage. By accident of birth in Middletown, Conn., he became an American citizen.

But did you know he holds dual citizenship?

The British law states that any child born of British parents is a British citizen, regardless of where he was born, unless he rejects that citizenship in writing. Dean Acheson, to public knowledge, has never rejected it.

Most of his youth he spent in Canada. Then he went to Groton, an exclusive boys' school, whose headmaster not only was educated in England but who patterned that school after the British exclusive schools. He was said to be "a lone wolf and a rebel."

I think he has evidenced these qualities in his office for regardless of what the country believes, he rebels against American thinking and is a lone wolf in his foreign policies.

He attended Yale and then Harvard where he came under the influence of Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter, another man who not only did not turn his back on Alger Hiss but who appeared in an unprecedented action as character witness before a court trying a man—that same Alger Hiss—on perjury charges involving treason to his country.

Dean Acheson has been in and out of public office in the United States since 1933 when he was Under Secretary of the Treasury. In the interim he has practiced a lucrative law practice in Washington. In 1940 he was an active member of the Committee To Defend America by Aiding the Allies. As a result of these activities, which aided in pushing us into the war, he was appointed Assistant Secretary of State in 1941.

He held that position under several Secretaries of State. In 1945, he criticized General MacArthur for attempting to make rather than carry out United States occupation policy in Japan and 2 months later, in November 1945, he spoke before a meeting sponsored by the National Council of Soviet-American Friendship. It was in December of that year that Maj. Gen. Patrick Hurley who had just resigned as Ambassador to China linked Dean Acheson with a group in the State Department which wanted to arm the Chinese Communists and bring about the defeat of Chiang Kai-shek and of attempting to defeat United

States policy in Iran. General Hurley at that time demanded a full investigation of the State Department.

Throughout his career as Under Secretary of State, Dean Acheson has always associated with persons and policies of the so-called left-wing group in the State Department. But in spite of that, upon the resignation of General Marshall, Dean Acheson was appointed Secretary of State by the President in 1949.

Since he has occupied the exalted office of Secretary of State, this American citizen of British parentage has constantly followed the foreign policy of Great Britain with whom he feels more at home by inclination, ancestry and education. He has permitted this country to drift into a defeatist attitude of "waiting to let the dust settle" in the Far East, in order that Britain might carry on trade as usual. He has no plan except to put this country into a strait-jacket of managed economy similar to the Government of Great Britain until some international events move him to some other vague plan.

This man, who has never held elective office in his life, has the power of life or death over our Nation.

It is not enough, that under his Sven-gali-like influence over a weak and vacillating President, that this great country—this strong Nation—has reached the impasse where we publicly announce that we will not fight an enemy and beg for peace at any price but now he proposes that he be absolute dictator over all American citizens.

State Department plans call for Acheson's absolute control over \$10,000,000,000 in foreign-aid programs which include ECA, point 4 and all military allocations of food, clothing, machinery, arms and ammunition. This would give Dean Acheson control over domestic prices and production in the placement of orders and demands for supplies and production materials.

He is already the undisputed boss of this Nation's foreign policy. He controls the public utterances of the Defense Department and a vast propaganda machine in the Voice of America. And only recently we find him using that same Voice of America in his famous guidance paper No. 28, dated December 23, 1949, which was circulated to all our diplomatic missions abroad which gave the false impression that the loss of Formosa would not damage the interests of the United States and that we had no interest in it which was contrary to all military advice. This was a deliberate lie and a party line attempt to excuse the fall of Formosa to the Red Communists when the time was ripe.

Through his allocations of raw materials, both domestic and foreign, he has served his mother country and the British Socialist Government.

All he needs now to complete his absolute control over the Nation is congressional approval.

I say the time is past due for this man to go. A supine President, a weak and stubborn President, has reiterated time after time that he will not call for the resignation of Dean Acheson in spite of

the loss of public confidence and public clamor for his removal. His policies have been proved a failure, and yet he is asking for more power.

There is only one solution—one way to get this albatross from the necks of the American people—and that is by this amendment which would deny funds to the State Department until this "lone wolf and rebel" is removed from public life.

I urge its enactment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

The preferential motion was rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could agree on a limitation of time for debate to 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object.

Mr. ROONEY. Make it 20 minutes?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You might as well withdraw that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Phillips amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York withhold that until the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] returns to the Chamber?

Mr. ROONEY. That will be all right with me, but I do not know about the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. He would object to you, anyway.

Mr. ROONEY. I know that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire recognition now?

Mr. ROONEY. I do, Mr. Chairman. I rise in opposition to the Phillips amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does that take precedence over the preferential motion that has been on the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had recognized the gentleman New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman has the floor. He cannot be taken off.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, our esteemed friends on the minority side of the aisle tried the blunderbuss approach, found it boomeranged so badly that they tried to run for cover. They tried the sharpshooter approach and found that such a blatantly illegal proposition had not the chance of a snowball in Hades. Now they want to dupe us with an amendment that is calculated to appear in the best interests of the Government. I refer, of course, to the so-called Phillips amendment, this ruse, the sole purpose of which, as everybody knows, is to



"get Acheson"—not by constitutional means but by a camouflaged bill of attainder act. Must we countenance this appeal that the means justify the ends? How low must we be called upon to stoop?

Where I come from great faith is put on a man's ability to stand up and fight for what he believes and what he thinks is best for the country. The people in my district do not like slippery, snide, and sharp practices.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I ask that those words be taken down, and I want to state the grounds.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman demand that the words be taken down?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do; and I want to state my reasons.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot state reasons when he makes the demand.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make the point of order that the words are out of order because they accuse Members on this side of slippery conduct.

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will kindly respect the Chair.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do. But under the rules of the House I have the right to state the reason why I complain.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman demands that the words be taken down?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. For the third time I say "Yes."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. ROONEY: Where I come from great faith is put on a man's ability to stand up and fight for what he believes and what he thinks is best for the country. The people in my district do not like slippery, snide, and sharp practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year 1952, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. ROONEY: Where I come from great faith is put on a man's ability to stand up and fight for what he believes and what he thinks is best for the country. The people in my district do not like slippery, snide, and sharp practices.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has listened to these words as spoken and as read twice. The Chair does not think that it should offend anybody for the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to brag of his constituents, as to their character or as to their ability.

It appears to the Chair that these words were spoken with reference to an amendment and not with respect to a Member of the House of Representatives; and therefore, there is no reflection on any Member of the House. The Chair so holds.

The Committee will resume its sitting.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. ROONEY. So that the gentleman from Michigan thoroughly understands what I am saying, I repeat: Where I come from great faith is put on a man's ability to stand up and fight for what he believes and what he thinks is best for the country. The people in my district do not like slippery, snide, and sharp practices.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand that those words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk reported certain words objected to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, those are not the words we object to. I want those words taken down that attacked the integrity of the Republican Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words.

The Clerk reported certain words objected to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the further words, and we will see if these are the words objected to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate the Chair's effort to find the exact words objected to.

The Clerk read certain words.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Let the rest of it come along. Let us have the words about the lynching, and about the Member from California.

Mr. CHELF. Read his whole speech.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think that would be a good thing.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts came too late.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is a little late, himself.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. His request was that certain words said back yonder should be taken down. The request must be made at the time the words are being spoken, and those have already been taken down.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts demanded that the words be taken down apparently as soon as they were uttered. The Chair is endeavoring to find the words objected to. He will have the Clerk report them as soon as they are transcribed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. When a demand is made that the words be taken down, and I am not stating this in any way in opposition to the efforts to have the words taken down, the words taken down

should be those that preceded the demand, not those that may have been expressed 1 or 2 minutes before.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would say to the gentleman that we had to let the gentleman develop his theme before we raised the point of order. Now I want the right words. The reference to lynching is what I want read particularly.

The CHAIRMAN. An effort is being made to find the right words.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORAND. In order to straighten out this entire situation, would it be possible for us to have the entire speech read? Then our friends on the other side would surely have the words they want.

The CHAIRMAN. An effort is being made now to have the words transcribed.

The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read certain words.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, what about the words to the effect that the gentleman from California was dishonorable?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, without in any way touching on the question or expressing my own views as to whether the remarks in reference to lynching violate the rules of the House, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may be permitted to withdraw the remarks objected to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would normally be very glad to have the gentleman withdraw his remarks, but in view of the way the gentleman has presented his remarks, making attacks upon the Republican membership and the gentleman from California in particular, these remarks are unparliamentary and should not have been uttered. I cannot let the gentleman withdraw them.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not conceding that.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is why I cannot let him withdraw them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, whenever this sort of thing has happened on either side, and Members have asked unanimous consent to withdraw their remarks, permission has been given.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But such a request is not preceded by the kind of statement you just made.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will withdraw my statement, if the gentleman is disturbed by the statement I made. That was my own personal expression. I will withdraw that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may be permitted to withdraw his statement in reference to lynching.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Remember, this is a precedent for the future.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair make a ruling on my point of order?



The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from New Mexico.

The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk reported certain words objected to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk reported certain words objected to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair in every instance of this kind has been most liberal with the Member who uttered the words objected to, because he has always thought that great liberality must be indulged in so that we may have free and full debate. On very few occasions has the present occupant of the chair held that remarks were a violation of the rules of the House.

The Chair can hardly agree, however, that the words, applied to the meeting of the Republicans in caucus yesterday were quite proper, and, further than that, he doubts very seriously if referring to legislative actions of those who are movers of legislative action should be using the methods mentioned.

The Chair thinks the words are a violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to expunge from the RECORD the remarks made and that he may be permitted to continue in order.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] restate his unanimous consent request?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] be permitted to expunge from the RECORD the remarks that he made which were found to be out of order, and that he be permitted to continue in order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think if such a request is to be made, it should be made by the gentleman who transgressed the rules of this House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is making a request, the whole of which cannot be made at the moment by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from New York will, following the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts, make a similar request.

The SPEAKER. All in the world the Chair is doing, and what he thinks every other man who is half worthy of occupying the position he occupies would do, is to bring about orderly procedure in the House of Representatives.

The Chair thinks in the interest of orderly procedure that the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts should be agreed to.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will proceed in order.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to expunge from the RECORD the words objected to by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am indeed sorry that I transgressed a rule of this House. I assure you that I did not intentionally do so. I am a bit disappointed that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] felt that I would attack the integrity of any Member of this House. I have never done so, and in my remarks today I certainly never intended so. I believe those in this House with whom I am intimately acquainted know that I uphold the integrity and the dignity of the Members of this House regardless of which side of the aisle they sit on.

I want to say also that I did not intend to attack the integrity of the Republican Party any more than I would attack the integrity of the Democratic Party. I believe in the two-party system; we must have a Republican Party and a Democratic Party, and I say—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, just a few moments ago the gentleman submitted a unanimous-consent request to close debate. He is now asking five additional minutes for himself. What does the gentleman intend to do with the rest of us? And when do you intend to finish the bill?

Mr. ROONEY. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan that I am merely trying to conclude my remarks. It is my responsibility as the floor manager of the pending bill to oppose this so-called Phillips amendment, and I would like time to advance many constitutional reasons why it should not be adopted. After I have concluded I expect to ask that debate be limited to some extent, but not to completely shut off anybody from speaking on the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman going to object when I ask to proceed for an extra 5 minutes?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right; I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. I myself will object to a continuance.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 4 minutes, and I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I object to that. If we are going to object to one, we are going to object to all for the rest of the day.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the gentleman's preferential motion on the ground that there has been no change in the bill since the previous motion of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK]. The parliamentary situation remains unchanged, and for that reason I must make this point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. I have learned to respect the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] deeply. I respect him for his experience, and his fair-minded approach to every question before this House. I am very much in sympathy with the objective he seeks to attain in his amendment, namely, to bring about the replacement of the present Secretary of State. However, I rise to suggest that what he seeks to do can be done by a better method.

Let me make it clear that I agree with many eminent members of both political parties that Secretary of State Dean Acheson has become a liability. I do not mean merely a political liability. I mean a liability to the American public. He is identified with policies that have dismally failed. In public thinking, he is associated with the biggest, the most glaring, the most tragic mistake ever made by leaders of the American Government, the mistake that has led us into more trouble than any other misjudgment of history, namely, the theory that if we just gave the red-handed leaders of the Russian Kremlin whatever they wanted they would be good and help us create a peaceful world. To the common garden variety of American citizen, who instinctively mistrusted a regime that sent men, women, and children into slavery and death, this was a risk not worth taking at all. Our Government took that risk, and now the American people are paying the penalty of a policy that failed.

In public thinking, Secretary Acheson typifies the policy of continued appease-



ment and collaboration with Communist regimes, at a time when those regimes threaten the peace and security of free peoples everywhere. He is linked with the loss of most of the gains for freedom made during World War II. Mr. Acheson is now, and forever will be, identified with the statement that he would not turn his back on Alger Hiss—at a time when every person in the State Department under any taint of suspicion of disloyalty should have been kicked out and replaced by those of unquestioned loyalty.

I respectfully suggest, however, that this amendment is unwise, and should not be agreed to, for these reasons:

First, it would set a bad precedent. I might even say it sets a dangerous precedent, to cut off the salary or pay of any public servant as a means of getting rid of him. We have the power to do so, but if Congress does this, what is to prevent the heads of the executive departments using this method of disciplining or firing the employees under them? It certainly could never be defended as good personnel management.

Second, a man is worthy of his hire. If Mr. Acheson is worth keeping on the State Department payroll, then he is worth his salary. If he is not worth his salary, then he ought to be forced to resign.

Third, this amendment would do by indirection what should be done directly by the President of the United States. I realize the loyalty shown by the President to his appointees, even when they no longer enjoy the support of many of our fellow citizens. But I believe that the President can be prevailed upon to take appropriate action in this matter. To that end, I feel that we of Congress should take direct action. Let us make our wishes known by way of a resolution. I have today offered such a resolution, as follows:

Whereas the present Secretary of State has become identified in public thinking with foreign policies that have failed to protect the gains made for freedom and security against totalitarian ideologies in World War II, is associated in public thinking with decisions that have permitted the extension of Soviet Communist power over many areas and many peoples of the world, and no longer represents the firm leadership in the conduct of foreign affairs needed to defend the honor, interests, and security of the United States, therefore it is the sentiment of the Congress that the present Secretary of State has lost the confidence of the American people, and that the President should request his resignation.

Such a resolution meets this question directly and squarely. Such a resolution would permit open hearings before the appropriate committees of this Congress. And quite certainly—if Members reflected the sentiment of the great majority of the people of our States and districts, such a resolution would pass.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I cannot see anything wrong with the gentleman's

method of proceeding here. I simply want to say that I agree with him.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Withholding the salary of Secretary Acheson would not in any way put him out of office as Secretary of State, would it?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think the gentleman is correct. It is not legal to serve in public office without receiving compensation. But if Mr. Acheson continued to serve, despite the lack of appropriation for his salary, he could go into court to force payment.

Mr. HARRIS. I mean by that, if the Secretary of State did not draw a salary, that would not prevent him from continuing to act as Secretary of State?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I believe the gentleman is correct. I am sure the gentleman understands that I want Mr. Acheson removed, but by direct action of the President.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Can the gentleman tell me how we could ever have the resolution considered or vote on it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on some limitation of debate on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 4:45. That will give pretty nearly everybody on the floor who desires to do so a chance to speak.

Mr. MEADER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

[Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not think that the offering of this amendment was a smart thing to have done. It will fail of adoption and, therefore, have the opposite effect to that intended. But it is here, and speaking for myself I will not run away from it. I have been saying from time to time, in season and out of season, that Mr. Acheson ought

to be separated from the State Department, and I cannot now belie these words by voting a contrary opinion.

For those of us who have been clamoring for Mr. Acheson's retirement to vote against the amendment would cast a hurtful reflection upon us.

Mr. Chairman, I have no bias against Mr. Acheson as an individual. He is undoubtedly a man of great charm and ability. But in my opinion, he has as a result of the policies that he has pursued inflicted more damage upon the country than any other man now living. That he has been and is pronouncedly pro-English, everyone recognizes. That he has been, that he is, and that he will continue to be pro-Russian in the sense of maintaining his policy of appeasement, I sincerely believe—the leopard cannot change his spots.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

(Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, if it would have been possible to persuade me to support the Phillips amendment, the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] would have accomplished that result. I will not be influenced by the inflammatory remarks he made, however, because my judgment on this issue goes far deeper than inflammatory remarks.

I do not wish to be construed as favoring the policies of Dean Acheson, or the State Department, either now or before Dean Acheson was appointed Secretary of State. Some of my colleagues have said that my vote against the Phillips amendment will be so construed. It should not be. I have repeatedly, and with all the force at my command, condemned the costly calamities of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. I have repeatedly urged that our State Department be strengthened and improved, in order that the United States may effectively discharge its responsibilities of leadership in the contest between freedom and totalitarianism.

I refuse to believe that my constituents will misconstrue my position, which I desire to make so plain as to defy distortion.

I regret that the Republican Policy Committee has endorsed the Phillips amendment directed at depriving Dean Acheson of the salary of Secretary of State. I regret it because I think such endorsement is detrimental to the prestige of the party and because it compels me to differ with the position of my party.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to differ with party policy because I believe firmly in the political party system, in party responsibility and party regularity. In union there is strength. Recognizing that legislation involves compromise, I have consistently sought in the past and I will seek in the future to harmonize my views with the leadership and the majority of my party, yielding ex-



cept on matters of principle on which I feel so strongly that I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, the issue before us is one of basic principle, on which I cannot yield.

I oppose the Phillips amendment for the following reasons:

First. Its constitutionality is doubtful.

Second. It contravenes our American doctrine of separation of powers, one of the checks and balances by which, in unique fashion, the American people have thus far preserved their liberties.

Third. It is presented as correcting an evil—namely, the impotence, ineffectiveness and ineptness of our Department of State—but it cannot correct that evil. It is thus dangerous as an illusory and deceptive remedy.

Fourth. The real remedy for the weakness, the vacillation and the disastrous failures in the conduct of our foreign affairs is a penetrating, non-partisan examination of our Department of State through congressional investigation with the objective of rebuilding and strengthening the instrument through which we express and carry out our foreign policy.

Mr. Chairman, I know the American people, perhaps all people, have a tendency to personalize their likes and dislikes of institutions. They do this through centering their attention on the head of the institution which is the object of their affection or their fury. I am not sure the Members of this House are wholly free from this tendency.

However, this in my judgment is not the sound approach to a useful analysis of public problems. I believe we, as legislators responsible for the course of this Nation, should do better than that. That is why we have established the republican, or representative form of legislature. Otherwise we could adopt national legislative policies by a public poll.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that the time for discussion of this basic issue is so limited, since I would like to discuss my reasons for my vote at greater length. However, I have previously made known publicly my position on the removal of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. In that public statement I developed more fully the reasons I have previously given in this debate for opposing the Phillips amendment. I quote from my statement of May 25, 1951:

Last week, 43 first-term Republicans of the Eighty-second Congress joined in a petition urging the removal of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. Although some newspaper accounts recited that I had joined in this petition, the fact is that I did not.

I am in sympathy with what I understand to be the ultimate objective of this petition; namely, to improve and strengthen the Department of State and to bring an end to vacillation and mismanagement in the conduct of our foreign affairs. But I disagreed with the method suggested for accomplishing this objective.

Congress is powerless to remove an official in the executive branch of the Government, and it seems to me to be an idle act to make a solemn pronouncement of a program which those who urge such a course of action are without any power to accomplish.

I am now studying the preparation of a resolution providing for the investigation of the State Department and the foreign and military policy of the United States by the Congress, with a view to its introduction in the House of Representatives. I would like to discuss with you informally the advantage of such a resolution.

In my judgment, a thorough-going, penetrating exploration of the organizational structure, the personnel, the operating methods, the policies, the decisions and the performance of the Department of State through a competent, dispassionate and non-partisan congressional investigation would be far more fruitful in improving the conduct of our foreign affairs than simply to remove Secretary of State Dean Acheson and supplant him with a new man. In the past decade, there have been five Secretaries of State—Cordell Hull, Edward R. Stettinius, James F. Byrnes, Gen. George C. Marshall, and Dean Acheson. Each new Secretary, upon assuming office, indicated an intention of modernizing and improving the State Department. Yet, I submit that the State Department is just about the same as it always has been.

The responsibilities of the Secretary of State, the size of the State Department, and the difficulty and complexity of the varied problems with which the State Department deals are such that any Secretary of State must, of necessity, be guided by the factual information, the opinions and the recommendations of subordinate officials in the lower echelons of the State Department. No man, however brilliant or hardworking he may be, can have the time to familiarize himself personally with the many matters for which he must assume responsibility before the public.

This being so, simply changing Secretaries of State but leaving the Department beneath him unchanged gives only an illusory promise of improvement. The philosophy and the policies which emanate from the Department through the Secretary are, and of necessity must be, the composite product of the organization far more than the work of the Secretary himself. Therefore, it seems to me that it is the organization which should be examined, and this examination should be comprehensive as well as incisive. The administrative methods of the Department of State, which are notoriously involved and cumbersome, should be carefully explored, and a determination should be made whether there is any reason for their continuance, or whether it is simply a case of hide-bound traditionalism and encrusted red-tape bureaucracy.

Many of you may recall the instance cited by a House committee 3 years ago, where a company in this country desired to send a check to its agent in Budapest, Hungary, to procure his return passage home. A House committee investigator discovered that the airline company's check and its letter had passed through 37 separate steps in processing in the State Department, being initialed and coded at various stages and had become bogged down in a plethora of red tape and unnecessary procedures.

No organization should be expected to produce satisfactory results if its operating methods are obsolete and unworkable.

The question of centralization of authority should be explored. Are agents in the field or in the various branches of the State Department clothed with adequate authority to make decisions and to take action for which they ought to be competent, or are there unnecessary and time-consuming initialing processes, coordinating committees, and other checks and obstacles which tend to bog down the progress of the work of the Department?

What of the personnel of the State Department? No matter how perfect an organizational structure may have been established,

far more important is the character and ability of the men who must make the decisions. Has the State Department been staffed with individuals inclined toward theorizing and abstract thinking in well-sounding but meaningless generalities, instead of hard working, hard thinking, hard bargaining, practical persons of intense and unquestioned devotion to the purposes of our democracy?

What have been the results of the handling of the specific business of our Government in the field of foreign relations? Have our interests been protected? Have our objectives been advanced? Or have we consistently come out second best at the bargaining table? For example, it might be fruitful for a congressional investigation to review such international conferences involving far-reaching decisions such as at Yalta, Tehran, Cairo, and Potsdam. An investigation might disclose the individuals, their capabilities, and perhaps their loyalty to our country and its interests, who represented the United States at such conferences. An assessment of the success of the results of those conferences and an ascertainment of the reasons for those results might well provide lessons and guides for the more successful handling of similar international negotiations in the future.

There has been no significant congressional exploration of the State Department in recent years. The Senate War Investigating Committee, of which I had the honor to be a counsel over a period of 4 years, in many of its explorations of the national defense program in World War II, had occasion to observe the operation of the State Department and the quality of its decisions.

My recommendation that a thorough-going investigation of the State Department be conducted by Congress at this time is, in part, based upon experience derived from the work of the War Investigating Committee. Hearings on lend-lease aid, both civilian and military, investigation of the disposal of billions of dollars worth of United States Government surplus property located in foreign lands after World War II, the investigation of the Inter-American Highway, the preliminary investigation of military government in Germany and Austria, plans made, or the absence of plans, for the acquisition of military bases and rights regarded as necessary to our national defense, and many other similar subjects were touched upon by the Senate War Investigating Committee.

Mr. Chairman, nothing in this debate, nor in developments in recent months, has caused me to change the position I took last May.

The Congress, not possessing the appointive power, which is a function of the Executive, is without authority to remove Dean Acheson or any other individual in the executive branch of the Government. It would be an abuse of the appropriating power of the Congress, even if it were constitutional, to do indirectly what may not be done directly.

Neither is it any justification to say that the Executive has invaded legislative jurisdiction and therefore retaliation is in order. The Congress should recapture its legislative power but should not undertake to assume responsibility for the execution of laws.

The Congress does have power to do something about the unfortunate weakness of our Department of State—it can first investigate, then legislate. That course is one of soundness, power, and wisdom. Seeking to appropriate an individual out of office is the course of



weakness, awkwardness, and ineffectiveness.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, it is not with the thought that I can add any substantial facts with respect to the Phillips amendment that I take the floor on this occasion. It is rather to lay added stress upon several aspects of the present debate which may serve to indicate that the opposition of many of us to the pending amendment springs neither from an admiration for the Secretary of State nor approval of the work that he has done in his vital post. To the contrary, there are few Members on this side of the aisle who would not cast an affirmative vote on a question of impeachment or an amendment providing that none of the funds appropriated in this measure could be expended for any purpose until the Secretary of State has been removed by the President.

Any attempt to interpret as a vote of confidence in the Secretary of State the votes of those of us who do not support the pending amendment, is a misrepresentation of our position, and should have no place in the official record.

For my part, I feel that my record of opposition is clear and unmistakable. On three occasions I have publicly demanded that the Secretary of State resign, and I am sure that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will bear out my assertion that I have lent my support to few measures proposed by the Secretary and acted upon by the committee.

I am opposed to the present administration because I feel that it seeks a change in the constitutional system of government under which this has become the greatest nation on earth. In opposing the administration, I oppose its policies, and I cannot, in my own mind, separate any individual policy or policies as being more objectionable than the sum of the parts.

In the action here proposed it seems to me that we are in effect telling the people of this country that Valhalla is just around the corner if we can only rid the administration of the Secretary of State. This is neither true nor is it an inference which should be left with the people of this country.

Whether Dean Acheson remains as Secretary of State or retires to the private practice of law, the repugnant policies will continue to be made and implemented within the councils of the administration.

This amendment seeks to sweep the Augean stables with a whisk broom, when nothing but an infuriated protest of the American people will do the job which must be done. It seeks to cut off a tentacle of opposition while allowing the intelligence behind present and past policies unhindered freedom of action.

Dean Acheson has been a partner in a disastrous course of action, domestic and foreign. He has long since lost the confidence of the American people, and that

lack of confidence has been expressed to me in private conversations by many of those who sit on the majority side of this House. He should go to trial—not a trial by attainder under provisions of legislation, which says, in effect, that no man with a mustache can serve in public office—but to a trial at the ballot box before the tribunal of American public opinion in November 1952. This is the American way, and the way of the Constitution. It is not that we who oppose this amendment hold a brief for the Secretary of State, but only that we deplore the back-door approach based on a matter of personalities instead of upon basic and fundamental issues.

Let the President of the United States answer for his conduct of public affairs to those who authorized him to appoint some of the political hacks he has placed in vital posts. I have no doubt as to the verdict that will be delivered. But I cannot agree that the Constitution gives us the authority to take any action, short of impeachment, in the instance of any individual who carries out the President's policies, mistaken and tragic as some of them may be.

If we have courage—if we have the strength of our convictions, based on sound fact and absence of hysteria—let there be drawn a bill of particulars against the Secretary of State and let his impeachment be demanded from the well of this House. Many of us who oppose the "mustache approach" to attainder and the principle, if not the fact, of ex post facto legislation, will lend our best efforts to the removal of any official against whom charges can be laid and sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

(Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I attended the Republican conference the other day, and in the absence of anyone else expressing this thought, I would like to say that there was not a single individual who arose in that conference to say a kind word for Mr. Acheson. I question seriously if there are more than a handful of Republicans, you could not even count them on the fingers of one hand, who would retain Mr. Acheson in office.

Some people disagree as to this method of expressing our disapproval of his administration. Frankly, I do not like it myself, but I have no other way of expressing it.

If any American had told us in the late months of 1945 after VE-day and VJ-day that less than 5 years after the war was over we would be in the precarious position we occupy today, we should have consigned him promptly to the booby hatch. Our position is utterly incredible. We are in precisely the same dazed frame of mind that afflicts half the people of Europe today. They are confused, bewildered, and bewitched by the march of events. Like the people of Czechoslovakia, who never realized for a moment what they were

getting into, when they gave the Communists in their midst an opportunity to wedge their way into the Government, we are suffering from a neurotic fear based upon our reluctance and our unwillingness to recognize the facts.

No other amendment will be offered. No other method will be offered by which I can express my views regarding Mr. Acheson. If any of my Republican brethren feel that they will be happy in opposing this amendment, and failing to do the thing that they know in their hearts should be done, that is for them to determine. As for me, this is the only way I can express my contempt for bungling of Mr. Acheson. So I am going to vote for this amendment because I will have no other opportunity. If ever there came a time when the Nation was ready to shout "quits," it is now. The Nation is completely disillusioned with the Washington Government crowd. It is fed up with Messrs. Truman, Acheson, and company on the foreign-policy circuit. There is widespread feeling of no confidence in the administration, and it is being reflected all the way through the Nation. We will have to wait until 1952 to turn Harry Truman out. Harry Truman says that he will not turn his back on Acheson—Acheson says he will not turn his back on Alger Hiss. I repeat, we cannot get to Truman until 1952. This is the only opportunity I will have to get at Mr. Acheson now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] that there is another way in which he can express himself in this situation, and that is the right way to do it. That is, to offer a resolution asking for the impeachment of the Secretary of State. That is the constitutional way to do it, if he really wants to get rid of the Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we might spin all kinds of fancy theories about how this ought to be done, but there is only one issue. Are you for Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State, or not? Let us not kid ourselves about whether this is the wrong way or the right way. I am surprised at some of my Republican friends who say that by all means this must not be done in this manner. Your mail has been no different than mine, and I dare say on either side of the aisle, as far as Mr. Acheson is concerned. You know that your people are not for Mr. Acheson continuing as Secretary of State, and you know that public-opinion polls show that he should be removed by a vote of 7 to 1 or more. Now, what are we going to do? This is the time to make up your minds, because the people of this country will construe our action here this afternoon as a vote of confidence or not. The present Secretary of State has done irreparable damage to our country. I join with my colleague, the gentleman



from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] in saying that we are reaping in Asia today what the Secretary of State sowed for us. He has let the dust settle and he is settling us. I shall vote for the amendment for the reason that I have lost all confidence in Mr. Acheson, and this is not a personal matter with me. This is the only chance that I shall have an opportunity to vote "no confidence."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

(Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that we now have the only opportunity that may be offered to voice our opposition to the man who by his words and deeds has rendered the greatest disservice to our country in my memory. Of course it would be better if we could go through the entire Department of State and root out every employee who cannot unequivocally say that he is diametrically opposed to all the philosophies of the Soviet.

I do not believe that any man should be allowed to stand on his constitutional rights when interrogated and hold a place of high trust in the Department of State or any other position of trust in our Federal Government. I am very much in favor of this amendment, because it affords us the only opportunity to show to the people of our country that the Congress of the United States is opposed to the present Secretary and that he should be removed and to direct the President of the United States to see that a man is appointed Secretary of State who fits into the scheme of life of our great country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] is recognized.

(Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think this amendment has peculiar applicability to the situation existing in the Office of the Secretary of State.

Mr. Acheson's law firm represented the Soviet government of Poland at a time when the Polish police state was being set up, and it was seeking a loan from the United States. At that time, of course, Mr. Acheson was acting Secretary of State temporarily away from his firm, but as acting Secretary of State he approved the loan that helped to set up the Red police in Poland. This approval of Acheson's was despite the earnest pleas of our Ambassador in Poland, Arthur Bliss Lane, to turn down this loan. On May 16, 1933, when Mr. Acheson was first being sponsored as a Government employee, Senator Tydings said:

It has not been said but should be said that Mr. Acheson has represented the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In other words, he has also in times past represented the Soviets.

Last year Mr. Acheson said he would do nothing to subvert or undermine the

Soviet Government or its system. Why will he not do that? Because he has represented these governments as clients. It could very well be that our foreign policy should be such that we should take measures to help the enslaved peoples of those countries to undermine those governments, but it will never be done under Mr. Acheson's policy, because they have been his clients. He recognizes them as legitimate governments, and they are not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized.

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in 1943 a bill was considered in this House, an appropriation bill, an amendment was offered which sought to fire three men by denying their salaries, and force their removal from the salary rolls of the Department of State. At that time I argued against it as being a bill of attainder. However, the amendment did pass, and it passed in the other body and was eventually tested in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court said it was unconstitutional and directed the Congress to pay the back salaries of these three men.

While this may not be a bill of attainder, I think it is in essence the same as a bill of attainder; and, as the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] said, it applies to only three or four people in our Government; so in spirit it is a bill of attainder and, of course, I would oppose it.

But I would oppose it also from another standpoint. I am one of those who believes that Dean Acheson has done a good job. I am not saying he has done a perfect job, but I want to stand up here and be counted at this time on his side. He was one of the architects of the United Nations, and the people of this country adopted that as a national policy. He spoke in the South for the Marshall plan before General Marshall spoke in Virginia for the plan which was eventually named the Marshall plan. Dean Acheson is the architect of the Marshall plan; it has done more in my opinion to stop communism throughout the world than any other one thing. So I am favorable to the plan and want to be counted as one of those who believes Dean Acheson has done a magnificent job. He is the greatest Secretary of State that we have had in many many years. At some future time I expect to speak at length on the leadership which Mr. Acheson has displayed during his tenure in the Department of State.

In my opinion, the Republican Party aided by its newspapers and radio outlets is attacking Mr. Acheson for partisan political advantage.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

(Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, it was once said by that noble Roman, Seneca, that "a great pilot can sail even when his canvas is rent."

The opposition in this House today reminds me of a great wind.

Thirty-six years ago the Cadillac Motor Car Co., of Detroit, placed an advertisement in the Saturday Evening Post. While many years have since passed by, I believe that its word remarkably fit the situation prevailing in this Chamber today—proving once again that there is nothing new under the sun. I wish to read some excerpts from this advertisement for the edification of the House.

In every field of human endeavor, he that is first must perpetually live in the white light of publicity. The reward and the punishment are always the same. The reward is widespread recognition; the punishment fierce denial and detraction. When a man's work becomes a standard for the whole world, it also becomes a target for the shafts of the envious few. If his work be merely mediocre, he will be severely left alone—if he achieve a masterpiece, it will set a million tongues a-wagging.

The leader is assailed because he is a leader, and the effort to equal him is merely added proof of that leadership. Failing to equal or excel, the follower seeks to depreciate or destroy, but only confirms once more the superiority of that which he strives to supplant. There is nothing new in this. It is as old as the world and as old as human passions—envy, fear, greed, ambition, and the desire to surpass. And it all avails nothing. If the leader truly leads, he remains the leader. That which is good or great makes itself known, no matter how loud the clamor of denial. That which deserves to live—lives.

I call upon the supporters of this amendment to abandon it and to stand up like men in constitutional impeachment proceedings to achieve their objective. Longfellow had a word for you, gentlemen, "better like Hector in the field to die, than like perfumed Paris turn and fly."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, when one becomes a public servant, he is always a target. One lives in a glass house. You are subject to a critical review by friend and foe. Dean Acheson is no exception. His refusal to turn his back on Hiss will long be remembered.

Here is a man who has been Secretary of State, and a poll taken of the American people would indicate that this man has lost the confidence of the American people. It does seem to me we have enough red-blooded Americans in this country to do the job of carrying on these functions of the State Department without using people whose loyalty is questioned. The straightforward way to get rid of Acheson would be by impeaching him. I would be the first one to vote for impeachment. I do not suppose that could be accomplished, because the machinery of impeachment is quite cumbersome. A New Deal committee and judge would stop all procedures.

A man who has so universally lost the confidence of the American people ought to be replaced. I think from a political standpoint it is better for the Re-



publicans to keep him in, he is good ammunition, but for the good of the country a man who has been in the position he now finds himself should no longer be Secretary of State. The people should impeach this man and the administration in 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE].

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Chairman, why do you not put the blame for world conditions where the blame really belongs? Why do you not put it on Joe Stalin and on the Kremlin? It has been stated that the American people have lost faith or confidence in the Secretary of State. They have lost faith, if any have lost faith, because there has been a constant undermining of the Secretary of State.

When the American people realize that we are not in a third world war; that conditions in Korea are looking better and that conditions in the Far East, in Iran, for instance, which has been an explosive can of dynamite with a very short fuse, are improving; when they realize that our international relationship there is looking up, there cannot help but be great confidence in our foreign relations. What more do they want?

Who in the world in this Chamber wants to be Secretary of State?

Certainly I do not and not one of you because it is a tremendous—an impossible job. One certainly without gratitude. No one knows from day to day what Joe Stalin is going to do. I squirm when I think of what you are trying to do to Secretary Acheson. I am just wondering what makes you say what you do. I would hate to say some of the things that have been said about him. Why do not you who are for this amendment produce evidence and facts and forget generalities?

(Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, I approach the question of this amendment with mixed feelings because I have known Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State, for over 40 years and naturally I have a personal affection for him. I believe he is a sincere American; there is no doubt about the brilliancy of his mind and his ability as a lawyer, but in the position which he now holds he is about as unfit as anyone that I can imagine. Unfortunately for himself and most unfortunately for the country, he has made statements which prompt people to question his loyalty and he has undoubtedly given too much weight to the opinions expressed by the representatives of Great Britain. The tried and true foreign policy of our country has been violated in various ways and the people, as well as many Members of Congress, are bewildered by the trend of events which do not reflect the real sturdy Americanism of our forefathers.

The simple fact is that the citizens of this country have lost confidence in the State Department and the Secretary of State, and when the people of this great Republic lose confidence in their

executives the whole system of our republican form of government is in jeopardy. The President has seen fit to ignore the attitude of the people in this matter and that makes it all the more serious. It is hard to understand with the situation as it is, why the President still places his confidence and trust in a man occupying such a responsible position who is totally out of touch with the country.

The present amendment, however, is the wrong way to eliminate Dean Acheson from the Government. Frankly, I have no better way to suggest, which, of course, places me in a weak position, but under our system of government and our procedure the Senate investigates the qualifications of the appointments to the President's Cabinet and, if they are acceptable to the Senate, there is no way that the legislative branch can remove them except by impeachment, and under the law Acheson has done nothing to warrant impeachment proceedings.

If such a law, as provided in the amendment submitted by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], had been on our statute books in years gone by, our Government would have been deprived of the services of such great men as Elihu Root, Charles Evans Hughes, and Henry L. Stimson, to name a few which come to my mind. That would have been a shocking loss to the country.

I think the amendment, while well meant and submitted in the best of faith by one of the finest men in the House, is contrary to orderly procedure and not in the best interests of our country. For these reasons, I shall vote against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. McGUIRE].

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment, but in order that you should know how I stand with the State Department, I am the one who threw the meeting into confusion about a year ago when the State Department invited the Members of Congress to come out to former Secretary Forrestal's home and I suggested that we recognize Spain and that we have a representative at the Vatican. So, I guess you know how I stand with the Office of the Secretary of State. But, as a former Democratic State chairman of Connecticut, I feel it is my duty to say that I know that Dean Acheson's father was the Episcopal bishop of Connecticut, one of the most revered clergymen in all the history of that State. In regard to the remarks made by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] about Dean Acheson's dual citizenship, I just telephoned Mr. Acheson and he does not have dual citizenship. The only citizenship he has is that of being a citizen of the United States of America. He was born in Middletown, Conn., one of the finest towns I have ever seen, on April 11, 1893. I have listened with interest to the Republicans hoping that they could have bipartisan representation in the State Department. I hope we can get the same number of Democrats down there as there are Republicans if there is a change, because it will be an improvement for the Democratic Party.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGUIRE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. In other words, the situation is about this: The amendment would ask us to repeat the decision of Pontius Pilate and send some one to the cross.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

(Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I was one of the first Members of the Congress to insist in March of last year that the Secretary of State be fired simply because I thought he had done a miserable job. However, I would like to ask my Republican friends this question: How long do you think his policies would have been implemented, good, bad, or indifferent, if they had not had the approval of the Chief Executive of this country? Therefore, you are directing your fire at the wrong person. If you do not like Acheson's policies, do you not know that if he were fired, either by your amendment or otherwise, his superior would not replace him with someone who would not agree with the President? That seems obvious to me. I do not see any particular point in firing a hired hand who will be replaced by the same boss simply because you disagree with the policy of the hired hand. Our foreign policy or the lack of one may be the technical work of the Secretary of State but, in the final analysis, the President must accept responsibility for it.

As much as I would like to see the Secretary of State replaced by someone who could command the confidence of the American people, I do not agree with the method of getting rid of him that is proposed by this amendment. I do not want my vote against this method of getting rid of him to be construed as any vote of confidence on my part in him or the policy of appeasement he represents.

The only fair way the Congress has of getting rid of an official of the Executive Department is that of impeachment as provided by the Constitution. That is the method you should employ if you really want to rid this country of Mr. Acheson but there, again, you would be faced with the fact that the man who appointed the Secretary would not appoint a successor who disagrees with the administration's foreign policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

(Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, very little can be said by me now that will add to what has already been said. In my opinion what is proposed to be done by the Phillips amendment would be a futile act. I have given thoughtful consideration to the proposal in trying to determine what I should do about it. It is my considered judgment that the passage of this proposed amendment would be nullified by the Supreme Court, on the authority of the case of *United States*



*v. Lovett* (328 U. S. Reports 303). Briefly, in that case it was sought to take three persons off the State Department payroll in a manner similar to the amendment before us. There the specific persons were named, here they are not.

In deciding that the action taken in that case was in effect a bill of attainder and consequently unconstitutional, the Supreme Court relied on two cases in support of its conclusion. They were *Cummings v. Missouri* (4 Wall. 277) and *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333). In its decision the Court stated—page 315:

Neither of these cases has ever been overruled. They stand for the proposition that legislative acts, no matter what their form, that apply either to named individuals or to easily ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment on them without a judicial trial are bills of attainder prohibited by the Constitution.

While the Secretary is not specifically mentioned in the proposed amendment, certainly a reading of the debate on it will disclose that this amendment is directly pointed at the object of removing Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. The Court rendered its decision by a unanimous vote, although one Justice did not participate. Six concurred in the main opinion and two agreed upon a concurring opinion that arrived at the same conclusion but did not declare the statute unconstitutional.

Today we witnessed the taking of the oath of a new member. We all solemnly take an oath to support and defend the Constitution. Consequently, in good conscience we must vote against a proposition that we feel is contrary to the Constitution. That is the way I feel.

There is another matter that I am thinking of in connection with this amendment. I want my party, the Republican Party, in the best possible political posture next year. Prominent men of both Houses of Congress of the Democratic faith have publicly declared and written that the Secretary of State is a distinct liability to the administration and should be removed. To make a move to remove him, which later would be declared void would make the Republican Party look as though they did not know what they are doing. We are not sent to Congress to practice futility. If we cannot, because of constitutional inhibitions, do a thing that our constituents think we should do or our judgment tells us we should do, we should be courageous enough to face the situation and notify our constituents of the impossibility of the proposed action.

Our Government is one of limited powers. The powers of Congress are limited. The Constitution specifically provides that bills of attainder and ex post facto laws are unconstitutional. Several times we have done things that have been highly publicized and by some persons lavishly praised. Later we have been rudely shocked to find that these acts were illegal, such as the case of the removal of Lovett, Watson, and Dodd. Then people begin to wonder if we in Congress know what we are about. Also, if such policies are sponsored by Republican members the people naturally

wonder whether our party knows what it is doing. I want the posture of our party to be such that in 1952 we will have a change in administration, which the great mass of our people are craving for. No political group should be in power for 20 years and practically everyone I know believes that. My hope is that we Republicans will by our record convince the people in 1952 that we have earned the right to be trusted with the management of the Federal Government. These are some of the thoughts that motivated my decision to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

(Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, those of my good Republican colleagues who are opposing this amendment claim they do so on the assumption, which I think is a correct one, that this is not the way to accomplish their purpose. This is an unconstitutional method, so held by the Supreme Court, and is really a useless waste of time. I base my opposition to the amendment on the same grounds as the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], and I want to compliment him on his statement.

I think Mr. Acheson has been an outstanding Secretary of State, and one of the best we have ever had. I think he has done a great job. I am directing my remarks now to the members of the Republican Party in this body and throughout the country, and I tell you that if you would stop your sniping and give him a chance and let him do his job, you would find he is doing a real job, and he will do an even better job, as the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] said, if you would only give him the opportunity. The situation in the Far East is looking up. I venture to say if you will only stop your incessant, unfounded criticisms and let him concentrate on his official duties, he will do a great job, and we will have peace in the world. But by keeping on what you are doing, you are playing right into the hands of Soviet Russia and the Communists, which I am sure you would not want to do.

Let us all forget partisanship at this perilous time in world affairs and concentrate on unity, both here and abroad, and we will have a better world to live in.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE].

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, I am not in sympathy with the foreign policy of the present administration. As a matter of fact, I think it has gotten us into great difficulty throughout the world, and if pursued will continue to involve us in many areas where we ought not to be.

Under our form of government, however, the President is entitled to select his Cabinet members and he also, of course, must take the responsibility for their actions.

I do not believe that the adoption of the Phillips amendment could possibly accomplish a change in our foreign pol-

icy. It does, of course, give each Member an opportunity to express himself, but that it all.

I repeat again that I do not favor the foreign policy of the present administration, but I cannot support the Phillips amendment.

(Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, there has been an unfortunate record made in this House today. In spite of the fact that we may expunge from the RECORD the remarks that were objected to, the fact remains that the public will know it in the press tomorrow. The unfortunate part of it is that the other side of the aisle, under the management of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], must resort to such tactics to accomplish their ends in this particular issue. The contrast is so evident between the kind of language the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] used when he was on the floor explaining his amendment, compared with the type of language used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

I doubt if any other nation on earth would retain in office a man as unpopular as Dean Acheson is, who has lost the confidence of the American people. The Democrats say we should impeach Dean Acheson rather than adopt the Phillips amendment. We know, and they know, that impeachment proceedings would never be acted upon by this Congress, under control of the Democratic Party. They are saying this to avoid action on the Phillips amendment.

Since we cannot obtain action on impeachment proceedings, the only action left to us to express our opposition to Acheson is by voting for the Phillips amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a Democrat from the great Southwest to oppose the Phillips amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot join with my Republican friends in their partisan attempt to remove Secretary of State Acheson from his office by means of withholding his salary. This I feel is a devious method of obtaining that which should be sought directly, and too flagrant a violation of the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court in the Dodd case, among others.

Therefore, I cannot fail to rise here on this floor to disavow this attempt and to say to my colleagues and my country that I am not a party to it. Let this not be interpreted as an endorsement of all that Mr. Acheson has done. It is not. But it is an expression of opposition to the means being used and the methods being employed.

I oppose the Phillips amendment.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BURLESON. May I compliment the gentleman on his courage and his



judgment. I join him in the sentiments he has expressed and in taking an action here which I doubt is popular in his area. It may not be popular in mine. But there is a principle involved, and I admire the gentleman for his statement. This is not the approach, either legally or morally, and I feel this is a test between right and wrong.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the gentleman very much, and agree with him thoroughly. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

[Mr. YORTY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to the amendment now pending. I sincerely hope it will be defeated.

However, several weeks ago, on June 7, I wrote a weekly newsletter to the papers of my district, in which I tried to analyze the problem of public sentiment as it affects Dean Acheson both in our district and State and nationally. I came to the personal conclusion that our foreign policy, that our Nation, that public sentiment would be benefited by a new Secretary of State. Yet, I think the tactics now attempted by this amendment are out of bounds and unjustified. I think the tactics being used today are exactly the tactics that have made the Republican Party so successful at remaining the minority party in our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF].

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote against this amendment. I shall do so for the simple reason that it is not only the American way and our tradition to allow every man a fair trial in open court, but it is the law of the land under our Constitution. In this particular instance Mr. Acheson is not being accorded a trial. He is being tried all right, but in absentia. The right and proper way to proceed is to introduce your impeachment proceedings here in the House of Representatives. Such action will accord the accused a fair and open trial before the Senate of the United States, who under the Constitution must sit as a jury. I urge this House to give to the Secretary his day in court. Why, no fair-minded, unbiased person would think of convicting the most hardened criminal or even a sheep-killing dog without an opportunity to be tried before a jury and to be represented by counsel.

As I stated the day before yesterday here on the floor in debate on this subject, I now repeat. I do not hold any brief for the Secretary. I have never been an admirer of Mr. Acheson, but I shall not allow my own personal feelings to sway or dwarf my sense of fairness. Your approach here is nothing more than ambushing the man from the rear. If you challenge the Secretary to a duel, serve notice on him, and then shoot it out face to face. Please do not follow

your present method, for it smacks of foul play. It might even be considered as a shot in the back. The Congress of the United States is the last place such questionable action should be taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina may extend his remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DEANE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

[Mr. FOGARTY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

[Mr. HALE addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in the several years I have been here, I have never encountered such an appalling lack of conscience as is being exhibited here. I have the highest regard for many of the Members on the other side and for the great party they represent. To see them deliberately, admittedly participate in a known unconstitutional act is the most disheartening, discouraging, and shocking exhibition that I have ever experienced as an American.

Let me add this. This is the language of the Supreme Court of the United States. They who support the amendment know that every word I say is true. There is no lawyer here who will not agree. The Supreme Court said:

When our Constitution and Bill of Rights were written our ancestors had ample reason to know that legislative trials and punishments were too dangerous to exist in any nation of free men then envisioned, and so they, the forefathers of this Nation, proscribed against bills of attainder.

There is not a man in this House, there is not a lawyer here worthy of the name, who does not know that that is so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

(Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, a friend of mine recently returned from Europe. In fact, last Saturday he sat in my office and told me how amazed he was to find out how interested the people in Europe were in the Congress of the United States. The Congress of

the United States means something to those people. It is a symbol. It is the greatest legislative body in the world. We have two major philosophies of thought in the world today: One, in the Soviet Union, that says a man is guilty until he is proven innocent; and we have our American way that says that a man is innocent until he is proven guilty.

A favorable vote on the Phillips amendment today and the people of Europe are going to understand that we are assuming the ways of the Soviet Union. Our people will understand that. That is a fundamental principle that they understand and they respect that we have denied a man his day in court; that we have refused to give him justice.

I have confidence that the Phillips amendment is going to be defeated. Why? Because I have confidence that the majority of this House is composed of people who believe in good sportsmanship, fair play, and justice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that if the Republicans wanted to give the Secretary of State his day in court, they have the means whereby they can do that, if they want to, and if they have the grounds to work on, by bringing impeachment proceedings against him? That is the honest way to do it, if they want to get rid of him.

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman is absolutely right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is recognized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe there has been sufficient debate on the Phillips amendment. I ask that we have a vote on it, and I urge that the Phillips amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I realize that there are a number of Members of this House who are Republicans who do not favor this amendment. I have always taken pride, as I have stated repeatedly on the floor of the House, in the high character of the debate that has taken place in this body in connection with all of the legislation relating to our foreign affairs.

This amendment we know cannot stand the test of the courts, because that has already been passed upon. It seems difficult for me to believe that a majority of the Members of this House without regard to party and without regard to feelings or emotional reactions are going to vote for this amendment with the knowledge that such an amendment, should it become law, could not stand the test of the courts.

My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] is a hard fighter, but he is a man whose intent is very kind. What has happened here today, of course, was the result not of any intent on his part, but because of ardor of my friend from New York and his



intense disposition to fight for the cause in which he believes.

Now, a few brief words with reference to Secretary Acheson. In my opinion unfortunately he made one statement of a regrettable nature. I am not going to condemn any person on one statement, or on one act, but as we view his record outside of that statement, look at the substance of his leadership as Secretary of the State and view his statements as an individual, his record is an outstanding one in the service of the country during this crisis. No one should be judged on one act or utterance. In justice to Secretary Acheson I want to make the statement which constitutes the views that I have about him.

In any event, on this amendment without regard to our party affiliation, knowing that it cannot be maintained in the courts, I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS) there were—ayes 81, noes 171.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: Page 58, line 15, insert a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 602. None of the funds provided in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger-carrying vehicle (other than a bus, station wagon, or ambulance); *Provided further*, That this proviso shall not apply with respect to any person whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur for a Cabinet officer; to situations where other mode of transportation is not feasible; to direct law-enforcement activities, and to the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, and reserve it.

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is practically identical with similar amendments that have been offered and approved in the other body. I think in the first instance the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] sponsored the amendment. It is my recollection that it is part of practically every appropriation bill that has been considered and enacted by the other body.

The reason for the amendment is rather obvious. If you will turn to page 6466 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 8, you will find a summary of the chauffeurs and drivers for passenger motor vehicles owned and operated by the Federal Government as of the beginning of the fiscal year 1951.

This particular appropriation bill that we have before us pertains to the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the judiciary.

Let us take some figures in reference to each department excepting the judiciary. According to a chart, inserted in the RECORD on June 8, it shows that the Department of Commerce in the District of Columbia had 21 full-time chauffeurs and other employees employed as full-time drivers. In the field, outside of the District of Columbia, they had 4 such employees, making a total of 25.

The Department of Justice in the District of Columbia had 14 full-time chauffeurs and other employees employed as full-time drivers. They had none in the field, making a total of 14 for the entire Department.

The Department of State in the District of Columbia had 17 full-time chauffeurs and other employees employed as full-time drivers. In the field outside of the District of Columbia the Department of State had 13 such employees, making a total of 30 altogether.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Would the gentleman's amendment have the effect of preventing an American ambassador in Europe having a chauffeur for his car?

Mr. FORD. The amendment, I believe, would. It excepts Cabinet officers, it excepts others connected with direct law-enforcement activities, and specifically except the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand from the press that in some other countries our representatives are not permitted to have a chauffeur, except if he be a native of the country where the ambassador or representative is acting.

Mr. FORD. I may say to the gentleman from Michigan, in reading these totals I would come to the conclusion that even under the present set-up the ambassadors do not have full-time drivers or chauffeurs.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. I have listened very attentively to this debate. I think the amendment is fair and reasonable in scope, and I think it is a way that we can save some money for this Government in this present emergency. I hope that all Members, regardless of party, will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FORD. I might say to the gentleman from Kentucky and my colleagues that it has become to be a very objectionable situation in the District of Columbia with so many of these Government limousine, of sizable design and style, running around here with full-time chauffeurs and other employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

may be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I ask if this applies to employees in the District of Columbia or all over the world?

Mr. FORD. It applies to any agency covered in this bill, excepting the Cabinet officer himself, the law-enforcement agencies or activities, and specifically the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I would gather thereby that it would be applicable any place where these various agencies operated throughout the world.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We are holding hearings in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on a bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], which seeks to put all the automotive equipment of the Government under the control of the General Services Administration.

We had some testimony 2 days ago on this very point. They pointed out that they were now inaugurating in quite a number of departments the pool system and thereby eliminating a lot of these cars that are assigned to individuals. I agree with the gentleman. I do not think these cars should be assigned to individuals, but I think where a chauffeur pool is maintained for the benefit of the agency that has proven to be effective. They have, as I understand, installed in the Department of State, for instance, a two-way radio system and a pool system. All cars are pooled with possibly one or two exceptions. They operate on the same two-way radio system that the taxicabs operate on, and thereby get the maximum use out of the cars.

Mr. FORD. I think the inclusion of this amendment by the other body on several appropriation bills has had a salutary effect in generating activity for the formation of Government car pools. Heretofore they just have not been getting around to such programs. It is a long-needed innovation in the handling of Federal equipment in the District of Columbia and elsewhere.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. While I am not ready yet to say that I think the bill introduced by the gentleman from Ohio is perfect, I respect the intent of it and have called hearings on this subject. I do believe we will come out with a piece of legislation which will be directed to this point, and it will cover all the agencies of Government, not just the agencies covered in this bill.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I think there is a great merit in the gentleman's amendment. I just want to be sure that we know just exactly where we are at. Does the gentleman seriously think, for ex-



ample, that Mr. Walter Gifford should drive his own car around London, and that Mr. Bruce should drive his own car around Paris?

Mr. FORD. There must be some other employee who is not a full-time chauffeur who could do it. My amendment affects only full-time chauffeurs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his reservation of a point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

KEEP FAITH WITH THE PEOPLE: REMOVE ACHESON

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, from what has previously been said, by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] and others, and it was said several times during the course of debate on this bill, it might be inferred that those of us who were in favor of the Phillips amendment were guilty of some kind of reprehensible conduct.

Those who urged that we were proceeding in a manner which required action which would not be constitutional, we will assume were sincere in their beliefs. That is, that they really thought that what we were trying to do and the method used was improper or as some said contrary to the Constitution.

I can see nothing wrong ethically, or in any other way, with an attempt to cut off funds for a group or class of persons that we do not like, do not want, and who are following a policy we think is not only bad but serious. I have been wondering whether, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from California had provided that none of the money should be expended in payment for the services of individuals who are members of the Communist Party if that would have been improper?

If we assume that Secretary of State Dean Acheson is one of the most patriotic of men, that his sole purpose is to serve the interest of his country, that he is a man of extraordinary intellectual ability, it is still true that our present dangerous position in international affairs is the result of policies which he and his advisers conceived, formulated, and followed.

Whatever may have been his motive or his purpose, we have been maneuvered into a position where it is said that upon the shoulders of our people—150,000,000—rests the duty and the obligation of imposing our form of government, our way of life, upon other nations—other peoples.

He and those who have been associated with him, either as superiors or as subordinates, are responsible for the present situation of Russia in world affairs—for the fact that Russia is, some say, our equal—others insist, our superior—in a military might. That policy makes it possible for her to now threaten the peace of the world, the continued existence of the Republic.

The Acheson-Marshall policy, as it has been characterized, is responsible for the dilemma in which we now find ourselves—engaged in a war in Korea which our people neither desired nor through their Representatives declared and from which, to date, we know not how to extricate ourselves.

It may be said that neither Marshall nor Acheson, being subordinate to the President and Commander in Chief, conceived or activated the foreign policy which we have followed. But whether that policy originated with them or was voluntarily implemented by them, or whether they acted under orders, both were, and are, free Americans and, if they believed the policies which they were following were detrimental to the interests of our country, in justice to themselves and to the country which they served, they should have resigned.

As the fighting in World War II approached the end, as it was apparent that the power of Germany was broken, that Japan was suing for peace, the policy which was followed by the State Department stopped our victorious armies on their march into Berlin, gave to Russia a foothold in Eastern Germany and, though her aid to win victory over Japan was not needed, permitted her to share in the victories of the Far East, ultimately gave her China and established communism there.

It was and it is the policy of the State Department which gave us and continues the Marshall plan, which calls year after year for billions of dollars to aid in feeding, clothing, housing, educating, and raising the standard of living of millions of people all over the world.

It is the policy of the State Department which called for the surrender of our sovereignty, of our independence as a Republic, for our membership in United Nations.

It is the policy of the State Department which calls for the fighting of an undeclared war, for an undisclosed objective, which has caused the death of thousands of Americans and the cost of which in dollars, supply, suffering and life no one can accurately estimate.

It is the policy of the State Department which now demands the conscription of millions of Americans, to be transported and maintained in Europe, over years which no one even ventures to number.

As a result of the policy of the State Department, free Americans are being regimented, shoved and pushed around at the will of appointed, not elected, bureaucrats, and upon their shoulders is imposed a tax burden which ultimately may destroy us, bring the end which Stalin desires. For Stalin knows, as should we, that the danger of this Republic, as has so often been pointed

out by our great statesmen, lies not in aggression by a foreign foe, but in our neglect or refusal to follow the principles enunciated in the Constitution, the example set by our forefathers, when by work, thrift and individual sacrifice, they made secure the freedom and the prosperity which we as a people have heretofore enjoyed.

The foregoing is but a partial and a very brief statement of some of the results of following the policies of the State Department, of which Dean Acheson is the head.

A few months ago our constituents in overwhelming numbers demanded that Secretary of State Acheson be removed; that the President be impeached if he refused to remove him.

We have been told that the Secretary of State does not intend to resign, that the President does not intend to ask for his resignation. It has been pointed out that there are insufficient votes to impeach and convict the Secretary of State.

Members of Congress have bitterly criticized Dean Acheson. They have repeatedly demanded his resignation. It is more than probable that, if the opinion of individual Congressmen could be secretly ascertained, an overwhelming majority would favor his removal from office either voluntarily or by request.

The State Department has lost the confidence of the American people. That confidence is absolutely necessary if we are to have a people united behind a foreign policy. The country will never willingly unite behind Acheson. They do not trust him.

If a majority of the Members of Congress sincerely desire that some other individual head the State Department, they now have the opportunity to make that desire effective.

That which the Congress creates, the Congress can abolish. In 1789 the Congress declared:

There shall be at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the "Department of State," and a Secretary of State, who shall be the head thereof (Revised Statutes, sec. 199).

The State Department exists because and only because of legislation enacted by the Congress.

The Constitution provides that—

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law.

It may be true that Congress cannot by direct action remove Secretary of State Acheson but it certainly has authority to abolish the office which he holds and it is equally certain that the Department cannot function except as the Congress appropriates money for that purpose.

It is idle to say that the Congress cannot cause Mr. Acheson to be removed.

It is doubtful if the President, Congress putting to him squarely the issue of whether he call for the resignation of Secretary of State Acheson or face a situation where the Department of State, the office of a Secretary of State, was abolished, would refuse to ask Dean Acheson to resign.



Boiled down, the issue is whether the Congress has the courage and the determination to insist upon the resignation or removal of a Secretary of State in whom the people have lost confidence and who has, over an extended period of time, been sympathetic toward the policies of Communist Russia, or whether it will permit Mr. Truman to continue in office a man whose policies, whatever may have been his motive or purpose, have permitted a communistic-dominated Russia to threaten the people of the world—the security of our Republic.

It is unfortunate that a majority of the Congress will not now, when opportunity offers, take action which will oust Mr. Acheson.

#### A TEST OF SINCERITY

When Douglas MacArthur was so abruptly relieved of his command in the Far East by President Truman, hundreds of thousands of our constituents protested that action and demanded that Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who was believed to be responsible for that action, be removed.

Many of us advised our constituents that we agreed with them in their statement that Acheson had lost the confidence of the American people and should be removed. We promised to do everything we could to see that he was removed. Have we lost our courage or do we now want more of the Acheson-Marshall policy?

The votes necessary to remove Dean Acheson are not available but the same purpose can be accomplished by telling Mr. Truman that we will not provide funds for the operation of the State Department as long as Acheson directs its activities.

If it be said that such a procedure which would cut off funds for other departments would be unfair and unjustified, the answer is that, until such an attitude be taken, until we show by our acts that we are sincere and will act, the Executive can and always will force its policies and personnel upon the Congress by including in every appropriation bill an appropriation for departments which are not under criticism.

Only by sending an appropriation bill back to committee with specific instructions can the Congress regain its authority to determine the policies to be followed by an executive department.

To prove our sincerity when we promised to take every effective action to remove Acheson, should we not now avail ourselves of this opportunity—force the President to remove Acheson, the friend of Hiss. Which does the President desire—the confidence of the people or the retention of Acheson as Secretary of State? He cannot have both.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hoffman] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am quite surprised that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford], for whom I have the greatest respect and who has a great deal of real ability, should offer this ill-advised amendment.

If I make any misstatement with regard to the figures I am about to quote, I trust the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford] will ask me to yield to him, but I believe I have the same figures he has.

Insofar as the Department of State is concerned in this amendment, and considering our important overseas activities covering the whole world, this amendment would apply to exactly two American full-time chauffeurs. It would apply, however, to 443 overseas foreigners, both full time and part time, paid out of the Department salaries and expenses appropriation. Now, overseas, throughout our 300 diplomatic posts, we must have locals driving our cars. If there is an accident, it is not proper, it is not the feasible thing to have an American driving our embassy car. If he were to run down a youngster he would involve us in all sorts of ill feeling with the people of that city or nation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The chart which I have, which was prepared by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and was received by Senator Ferguson from the senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. Byrd, is on page 6466. The chart shows that for the Department of State there were, as of the date mentioned in my remarks, 30 full-time chauffeurs and other employees employed as full-time drivers.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not know where Senator Ferguson got the information on which he embarked on his expedition, as the result of which he proposes to save a handful of dollars. But I assure you the figures I have from the Department of State show number of overseas chauffeurs fiscal year 1952 budgeted under departmental salaries and expenses: American, full time, 1; American, part time, 1. Locals, full time, 382; part time, 61.

Let me interrupt myself here to say that I have been most critical of the business of all these Government cars and chauffeurs traveling around Washington. We see them up here on the Hill every day. We can save money with regard to some of them, but I believe in saving money sensibly.

Let us take the Department of Justice, in which is included the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Federal Prison System, and other highly important branches of our Government. The Department itself has in the District of Columbia exactly 10 chauffeurs. They have 6 cars, 2 station wagons, and 4 trucks for mail, and so forth, which those 10 chauffeurs drive. Do you think it is sensible to cut them out?

Although the FBI is excepted under the terms of the gentleman's amendment, I might point out that there are only five chauffeurs in the FBI in Washington.

In the Immigration and Naturalization Service here in Washington there are only nine chauffeurs.

In the Bureau of Prisons there is only one.

These are the facts. Mr. Chairman, I do not like this business here in the District of Columbia of too many chauffeur-driven cars any more than anyone else, but let us be sensible about this pending amendment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. It would seem to me that if the time of the people affected by this amendment is worth anything, the amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

With regard to the people whom this amendment affects, the 443 foreigners I mentioned a while ago, they are mostly paid overseas from counterpart funds. Is it not more sensible to use foreigners to drive our embassy cars in many places overseas and pay them out of our surplus property credits rather than have those credits remain unused and probably never collected?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Is it not a fact that the average salary of such employee overseas is about \$1,200 or \$1,300 a year?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not believe it is that high.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the so-called Ford automobile amendment be voted down as ill-advised.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired, all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Ford) there were—ayes 97, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 58, after line 14, add the following new sentence:

"None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to pay an assessment to any international organization which exceeds one-third of the total annual cost thereof."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the Record immediately preceding the vote on the so-called Phillips amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I offered an amendment which was identical in purpose with the amendment I now offer; however, the amendment which I offered on yesterday was hastily drawn, I confess, and was subject to a point of order.

I am therefore resubmitting the amendment to the House and honestly



ask your serious consideration. The purpose of the amendment is to place a ceiling on the United States proportionate share of funds to maintain these international organizations. I think it is fair—I think it is proper—that the United States should be called upon to pay its proportionate share; by the same token, I believe that it is unfair and improper that we should be called upon to pay a disproportionate share, particularly in view of the fact that we are fighting 95 percent of the United Nations' war in Korea today.

A study was made last year by both the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee of the other body on the subject of America's proportionate contribution to these various organizations. We find from this report which accompanied House Joint Resolution 334, Eighty-first Congress, that contributions of the United States to various international organizations have ranged from 4 percent to more than 75 percent. We find that the United Nations, which I understand is composed of some 59 or 60 member nations, was being supported during the fiscal year 1950 to the extent of 39.89 percent by the United States. That, I repeat, is not to mention the thousands of American boys who have died on the battlefields of Korea, fighting alongside the token 5 percent contribution of the United Nations in manpower.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman should be complimented on offering this amendment, which will place some of our foreign relations more in line with what they should be financially.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman. Common sense and fairness, in my opinion, dictates that this amendment, limiting our contributions to 33 1/3 percent of the total, be adopted.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to point out that there are figures in my office which prove that the citizens of other nations have imposed upon them a lower per capita debt than the citizens of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is undoubtedly true. I may say further that the arguments made yesterday to the effect that we are legally bound to support these organizations to any disproportionate extent are completely and wholly, in my opinion, in contradiction of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. I agree with the gentleman that the least a nation should do would be to contribute as much money as its nationals employed at the UNO receive back. Does the gentleman know of any instance where that is not so? From the percentages the gentleman

gives of America's contribution, it would indicate that some nations, for their own nationals employed there, received more than those nations put in.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman is probably correct. I do not have those figures, but I do know that most of the money that is paid into these organizations by these other countries is given to them by us through the Marshall plan, so that we are actually paying a much greater percentage than might appear on the surface.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Why should we pay 33 1/3 percent?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is just a figure that I drew out of the report I mentioned a while ago. The committee felt that this average was too high, that is, the average that was contributed in 1950, of 35.35 percent. Then Mr. Hickerson, of the State Department, appeared before the committee and testified—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And Mr. Hickerson said that his reference during testimony to 33 1/3 percent was the amount "which the United Nations General Assembly has recognized as the maximum that any state should in normal times be asked to contribute" to that organization. That was the State Department's word for it, and I think should be the absolute ceiling.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would just like to say that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi is not without precedent, because in the supplemental appropriation bill which passed the House here about 4 weeks ago that ceiling, the exact percentage which the gentleman has in his amendment, was imposed on one of the international funds, for the agency which worked through the United Nations.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Along the line suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] a while ago, is it not a fact that the United States owes more money than all the rest of the world put together; that our national debt amounts to more than the combined national debts of all other countries of the world put together? If so, then why should we try to finance the world and fight everybody else's wars throughout the world?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Can the gentleman tell us what good some of these organizations do for the United States of America that would warrant even 33 1/3 percent?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I certainly cannot tell the gentleman. My imagination is not that good.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the Committee two reasons why this amendment should not be adopted. The first reason is that the money appropriated in this bill is for the calendar year 1951. All of these agencies, these international organizations, operate on a calendar-year basis rather than a fiscal-year basis. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi would impose 33 1/3 percent on this year's operations, and we have already obligated ourselves to contribute, in the case of the United Nations, 38.92 percent; the World Health Organization, 35 percent; the Child Welfare Organization, 35.7 percent, and UNESCO, 35.5 percent. However, next year's contributions have been lowered to exactly one-third, 33 1/3 percent, in every organization under the United Nations, but not so for this year. Now, several programs are under way. Various programs operated by these specialized agencies are being conducted, and where we, of necessity, default for 6 months, because we do not appropriate until July 1, they are using funds out of the working capital fund which will be repaid when the United States Government makes its contribution. Consequently, this amendment would of necessity force a curtailment of operations or cessation of programs that are half way through, that have already been started.

Of course it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish to stop the program in the very middle of it or during the latter part of the year. Second, if we adopt this amendment, it is going to be accepted as a fair figure, and there will be little incentive left for delegates representing the United States to these various conferences to seek a lower figure, because this will in effect say that 33 1/3 is a fair percentage for the United States Government to contribute. I do not think that is true. I think we should continue to strive to bring these contributions down below the 33 1/3-percent level.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.



Mr. MAUSFIELD. I think the House should know that the gentleman now addressing us is an advocate of economy in government. The proof lies in the fact that he was responsible for getting a reduction in this Government's budget appropriation to UNESCO this year, and has worked toward that end in years past for all international commissions and agencies.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman for the compliment. I did make the motion in Paris on the part of the United States Government to reduce our contribution to one-third, thereby saving us for the remaining years the sum of \$435,000 annually. After a long debate, requiring all of 1 day, the proposition was finally carried. That will be our contribution after this year. But please bear in mind that voting for this amendment now would disturb the program of every specialized agency in the United Nations, and such as the Pan-American Union, the Pan-American Railway Congress, the Pan-American Sanitary Organization, the Caribbean Commission, and the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences. All of those agencies would be compelled to revise and revamp their program for the remainder of this calendar year. After that the contributions will, as I say, to all of the United Nations organizations be exactly one-third, including WHO, because it was reduced at Geneva. The World Health Organization contribution was reduced at Geneva to one-third this year also.

So I say it is not good business, it is not sensible, to adopt this amendment and cause complete disruption of all of these programs during this year. It would certainly be more sensible to present this amendment to this same bill when it comes up next year. There would be some logic, some reason in that. But at this time it is highly inappropriate and untimely. I ask you to defeat the amendment.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I now ask for a vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that Members follow the logic advanced by the able and distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON]. I warn that if we were to adopt this amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi it would do more to disrupt the harmonious relations we have with our own good neighbors right here in this hemisphere, with the peoples of Central and South America, than any incident which has happened in over a century.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of

Mississippi) there were—ayes 117, noes 123.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PRESTON and Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 155, noes 137.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 58, line 14, insert a colon at the end of the sentence and add the following: "Provided further, That any funds provided by this act shall not be available for the compensation of persons performing information functions or related supporting functions in excess of 75 percent (on an annual basis) of the amount budgeted therefor in the President's budget for 1952. For the purposes of this section the term 'information function' means functions usually performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title; and the term 'related supporting functions' means functions performed by persons who assist persons performing information functions in the drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating of public information, publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, and similar material."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill, legislation defining terms and functions; therefore, contrary to the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the point of order raised is not pertinent to the purposes of this amendment, which merely places a restriction on the amount of money that might be used where it is being used for publicity purposes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not addressing himself to the point of order, but rather explaining his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman on the point of order. That is the question now before the Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is my view that this amendment is in order and that it is germane to the bill now under consideration. It provides merely for a limitation on this appropriation bill of 25 percent in the amount that can be used.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As it was read, very clearly it is merely a limitation on an appropriation bill; and if that is so, it should be in order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has offered an amendment, which has been reported. The gentle-

man from New York [Mr. ROONEY] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground it contains legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of the rules of the House.

While the gentleman may intend the amendment as a limitation, it certainly contains language that goes further than a mere limitation on an appropriation bill. The provision in the amendment seeking to provide a definition, and other language contained in the amendment, is beyond the scope of a limitation on an appropriation bill. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 58, line 15, add a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant after August 1, 1951, through the fiscal year 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to the Department of Justice, except General Administrative personnel;

"(e) to the Bureau of Investigation;

"(f) to the judiciary branch;

"(g) to the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

"(h) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2.

*Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of August 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am sure every Member of this House is familiar with the Jensen amendments which have already been adopted on five appropriation bills.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. In view of the fact that this very amendment has been debated many times since the first appropriation bill was reported this year, I believe everyone here is familiar with the so-called Jensen amendment. We had a roll-call vote on it, as I recall, only yesterday. I wonder if we cannot agree to conclude the debate immediately and vote?

Mr. JENSEN. There are some exemptions here I think I should explain. It will take only a short while.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman asking that all debate on this section be closed or only on the pending amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. Merely the Jensen amendment and all amendments thereto.



The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Section (d) pertains to the Department of Justice. It exempts the Department of Justice with the exception of general administration personnel.

Section (e) exempts the entire Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Section (f) exempts the entire judiciary branch of the Government.

Section (g) exempts the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Do the exemptions include the border patrol of the Immigration Service?

Mr. JENSEN. It is part of the Justice Department, and is a law-enforcement branch of that Department.

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes; my amendment would exempt them. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Did not the gentleman tell me earlier in the day when he very kindly let me have a copy of his amendment that it did not apply to our Immigration and Naturalization Service,

Mr. JENSEN. I must have misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is exactly the question I asked the gentleman. It ought to exempt the Immigration Service, because today it is woefully undermanned and thousands of aliens are pouring into this country over our border.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, it exempts the Department of Justice.

Mr. JENSEN. It exempts the Department of Justice except administration personnel.

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad to hear that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is excepted.

Mr. JENSEN. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has not increased its personnel in the past number of years, and they have taken on many added responsibilities. So, we exempted the Civil Aeronautics Administration because we tried to encourage those agencies which have done a good job in holding down their employees and hence, their expenditures. Other than that this amendment is identical with the five previous amendments which I offered and which this House has adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, may I point out that this proposed Jensen amendment would include our Foreign Service overseas. Now, if there is any sense, with the world situation as cru-

cial as it is at this time, and with peace in Korea in the offing, to gut our Foreign Service by the terms of this so-called Jensen amendment, then I just do not understand anything. This amendment would gut shoot the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Office of International Trade of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the National Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, all of whom have been designated as defense agencies. The gentleman from Iowa has no more idea of the important work on guided missiles and proximity fuzes and other such technical defense matters handled by the Bureau of Standards, which, incidentally, had a great deal to do with our perfection of the first atomic bomb, than the man in the moon.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Jensen amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 142, noes 127.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: On page 58, line 14, insert a colon at the end of the sentence and the following: "Provided further, That any funds provided by this Act shall not be available for the compensation of persons performing domestic information functions or related supporting functions in excess of 75 percent of the amount provided herein."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the full time allowed me. It is late. I merely want to point out that on three previous occasions the House has adopted amendments designed to limit the amount of money that may be expended for publicity or propaganda purposes.

My amendment merely proposes that not more than 75 percent of the money which is used for publicity purposes shall be used within the fiscal year. That means you have a saving of 25 percent of the amount used for that purpose if my amendment is adopted.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of July 19, 1951]

FREE-LANCE WRITERS PAID \$1,500,000 BY STATE DEPARTMENT

(By Willard Edwards)

The State Department is subsidizing American free-lance writers at a cost of \$1,500,000 a year.

It is providing the major radio-broadcasting systems with another million and one-half a year in income.

Motion-picture companies are collecting \$8,500,000 annually under the State Department's propaganda program.

#### OTHER GROUPS BENEFITING

So-called public-opinion polls and prominent universities are receiving fat checks for their propaganda services.

Book and magazine publishers are collecting more than \$1,000,000 a year for similar activities.

Libraries and educational institutions are receiving close to \$1,000,000 annually. Press associations, telegraph and cable companies, news-reel companies, television companies, and teletype services get another million a year.

This flow of gold to individuals and organizations which are in a position to control public opinion in the United States is exposed in copies of State Department contracts covering expenditure of approximately \$27,000,000 which have been secured by the Chicago Tribune.

#### CONCEALED FROM PUBLIC

These contracts, carefully concealed from the public, offer an explanation of why the State Department continues to receive acclaim from certain prominent columnists, radio commentators, spokesmen for the motion-picture industry, university officials, magazine editors and book publishers.

The revelations of Communist influences under State Secretary Acheson and our diplomatic disasters abroad have not stemmed a tide of printed and spoken praise of the State Department.

Disclosure of the contracts indicates that these supporters of Acheson have a financial interest in keeping him in office in addition to their sympathy for his policies.

#### FREE-LANCE FUND

The contracts cover only a portion of the operations of the State Department's international information and educational activity branch. This is the propaganda unit which includes the Voice of America and it is supposed to spread the American viewpoint throughout the world in opposition to communism. It cost the American people approximately \$100,000,000 in the last 12 months.

But much of the State Department's spending, the evidence reveals is devoted to the judicious allotment of funds to persons and organizations which can impress their opinions upon the American public.

The free-lance writer fund of \$1,500,000 a year has been a jealously guarded State Department secret. When it was first the subject of inquiry at a recent executive session of the House Appropriations Committee, Edward W. Barrett, Assistant State Secretary for Public Affairs, reluctantly conceded that free-lance material was bought to a limited extent. He said he did not know the amount spent for such material.

#### INFORMATION LATER PROVIDED

The information was later provided. The propaganda branch, it was disclosed, gave \$1,471,593 to free-lance writers in the fiscal year just ended and planned to spend \$1,502,355 in the current fiscal year.

Congressional investigators noted that this fund could be parceled out to newspaper columnists, reporters, radio commentators, magazine writers, and similar professionals who were beating the drums for the State Department.

John L. Dunning, Chief, International Press and Publications Division, was questioned about a \$135,760 fund marked for purchase of specially written byline articles.

"We purchase items from leading American magazine writers," he said, "and from experts in technological fields. We select a writer who is competent to cover the subject, contract with him for the article. He delivers it and we simply send it to our missions in the field by wireless or mail."

#### CAREFUL COVER-UP

The committee got no information concerning the recipients of the money.

The contracts secured by this newspaper revealed a number of the writers who received money for this type of service. But a careful cover-up was maintained in some instances. One contract, under the heading



of the International Broadcasting Division, read merely as follows:

Various scripts for programing----- \$230,467  
Various announces----- 270,531  
Various free-lance artists----- 38,897

A contract with the Washington Post, known in Washington as the State Department's most vociferous defender, showed the payment of \$2,050 for the printing of 50,000 booklets entitled "Herblock Looks at Communism."

Herblock is Herbert Block, Post cartoonist, whose views on communism for a period of years have been expressed in violent attacks against the House Committee on Un-American Activities and all investigations of subversion in the Government.

Other contracts for writing, editing, translations, layouts, artwork, cartoons, and research showed the following recipients of State Department funds:

Wynn Stephanson, New York City, \$2,392; Richard Burgl, Chatham, N. Y., \$515; George Debs, Brooklyn, N. Y., \$2,000; Aaron M. Burns, New York City (photos, stories, artwork), \$102,033; Kennedy Associates, New York, \$3,800; Eric Godal, New York, \$550; Nina Rittenberg, Seaford, L. I., N. Y., \$900; Simon Menache, New York, \$763; Terry Haas, New York, \$1,853; Richard Schwartz, River Edge, N. J., \$1,933; Peter Palazzo, Staten Island, N. Y., \$1,500; Allen Whiting, Jr., Brooklyn, N. Y., \$500; George Cronyn, New York, \$300.

Harris Peel, Washington, was paid \$440 for articles on the point 4 agreements. Robert Clark Honey, Washington, received \$425 for articles covering the visit of French technicians to the United States. Robert K. Butcher, Washington, received \$500 for articles on Human Rights in the United States.

#### LUCE PUBLICATION

Life magazine, a Henry Luce publication, collected \$500 for an American Revolution pamphlet. Life-Time, Inc., received \$5,169 in another contract and March of Time, a motion-picture affiliate, collected \$2,362 in a contract with the State Department.

Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Inc., received \$7,327 for its services. William O'Rilley, San Juan, P. R., received \$1,600 for miscellaneous articles.

Two State Department contracts, each worth \$12,500 to the recipient, have not yet been awarded, the records showed. One is for a tourist behavior booklet, and the other is for a pamphlet on information activities.

The National Society of Seniors, Inc., Washington, received, \$875 for a pamphlet entitled "Life in America for Persons Over 60."

At the time these contracts were signed, the international information and educational branch of the State Department had 5,956 employees on the payroll and was asking for an increase to 9,883 employees for the current fiscal year. The need for contracts such as above, with persons not on the payroll, was not explained by the State Department.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of July 22, 1951]

**MOVIE AND NEWS-REEL FIRMS PROFIT UNDER STATE DEPARTMENT PLAN—EVERYONE FROM PRODUCERS TO WRITERS ON GRAVY TRAIN; ACCOUNTING OBSCURE**

(By Willard Edwards)

Ten million dollars of the State Department's propaganda fund went last year to the motion picture industry and its employees.

News-reel companies, which devote much of their output to the speeches of President Truman and administration officials, garnered substantial contracts from the fund.

More than 300 script writers received fat checks ranging between \$1,000 and \$14,000

for composing skits to impress foreign people with the American viewpoint.

#### HAS 6,000 ON PAYROLL

Contracts were awarded to these individuals despite the fact that the State Department employs 6,000 skilled professionals at salaries between \$8,000 and \$12,000 a year to provide the same material.

The subsidizing of free-lance writers, radio broadcasters, book and magazine publishers, universities, and educational societies has been revealed in previous articles. The pouring of funds into the motion picture world has raised the question whether this money was devoted to anti-Communist propaganda abroad or to combat State Department criticism at home.

Secret contracts obtained by the Washington Times-Herald reveal the receipt of large amounts by firms and individuals in the motion picture industry. But mysterious gaps were encountered.

Contracts with 277 individuals, missing from the records, were lumped under the heading: "Miscellaneous \$383,346."

#### INFORMATION UNAVAILABLE

At another point in the records, there was a brief notation: "Miscellaneous contracts with 21 companies or individuals—\$174,237."

In accounting for expenditure of \$2,244,000 for motion picture equipment, a report merely stated: "Equipment contracted in Paris by American Embassy. Contract information not available."

Members of the House appropriations committee have been baffled in attempts to get more definite information on such details from the State Department. They have demanded the names of all recipients of a mysterious \$1,500,000 fund apportioned last year to free-lance writers.

Investigators suspect that this fund may have been used to increase the income of newspaper columnists, radio commentators, and magazine writers who have been consistent defenders of State Secretary Acheson against charges that his policies have been influenced by Communists in his Department.

#### DEPARTMENT PAYS WELL

The State Department pays by Hollywood standards when it contracts for the services of movie script writers not on the Federal payroll, the contracts reveal. Here are some of the contracts awarded to individuals in the fiscal year of 1951:

Don G. Williams, \$4,454; Gardner Hart, \$2,500; Jay Dresser, \$3,000; Frank Gulick, \$2,500; Fillimore J. Phipps, \$2,800; Richard L. G. Devereall, \$1,250; Ray Hargrave, \$8,000; George Worford, \$1,500; Sam Rose, \$2,367; Alex Greendale, \$2,367; William O'Brien, \$1,900; Sigmund Miller, \$4,100; Curtis Mitchell, \$2,094; Guy K. Benson, \$2,951; Joseph Krungold, \$5,247; George Axelrod, \$1,892; Sam Locke, \$1,845.

Lester L. Cooper, \$1,690; Alden Stevens, \$2,700; James Schwep, \$13,775; Erskine F. Gilberg, \$1,350; William Dufty, \$5,000; Paul R. Thoma, \$2,875; Paul Alley, \$5,521; Arthur Zegart, \$2,400; Donald C. Cameron, \$1,586; Frederick K. Rockett, \$1,072; Jack Leib, \$4,514; Charles Downs, \$2,550.

#### \$3,300 PER TRANSACTION

Twenty-nine individuals thus received \$95,800 for their services, an average of \$3,300 a transaction.

Contracts with newsreel companies included the following:

Warner Brothers, Inc., \$67,762;  
Movietone News, \$3,500;  
March of Time, \$13,000;  
RKO-Pathé, \$96,146;  
Paramount Pictures, \$13,845;  
Hearst Metrotone News, \$72,648.

#### SYRACUSE GETS \$246,121

The largest contract for a motion picture production, the nature of which was not

identified, was with Syracuse University for \$246,121. The same university received another contract for an evaluation survey, an attempt to discover if the Voice of America was accomplishing anything.

Other contracts with motion picture companies:

Universal Pictures, \$62,849; Sound Masters, Inc., \$186,249; Cascade Pictures, \$20,449; Columbia Pictures, \$1,000; United World Films, \$2,500; Twentieth Century-Fox, \$1,800; Film Graphics, \$2,000; Educational Film Corp., \$9,200; International Film Foundation, \$24,614; David Robbins Prod., \$14,512; Caravel Prod., \$10,000; Willard Pictures, \$20,493; A. F. Films, Inc., \$10,000; Untly Films, \$5,111; Knickerbocker Prod., \$4,032; Robert Carlisle Prod., \$20,215; Telenews Prod., \$12,847; C. & G. Film Effects Co., \$78,034; Cineffects, Inc., \$85,275; Film Optical, Inc., \$50,682; Q. Q. Motion Picture Titles, \$54,168; Reeves Sound Studios, \$41,815; Emil Velazco, Inc., \$56,189; Victor Animatograph Corp., \$132,582.

The State Department contracted with the Society for Applied Anthropology for a movie script, the nature of which was not supplied. The price was \$40,500.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, apparently the amendment as now drawn is parliamentary correct.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment because it does not belong in the bill. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 131, noes 137.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Flood and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 154, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded reading the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4747) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 336 he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.



The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLEVENGER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 15, line 3, strike out "\$85,000,000" and insert "\$70,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 141, nays 245, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—141

|                  |                 |                 |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Aandahl          | Fellows         | Potter          |
| Abbt             | Fenton          | Poulson         |
| Abernethy        | Gamble          | Rankin          |
| Adair            | Golden          | Reece, Tenn.    |
| Allen, Calif.    | Goodwin         | Reed, Ill.      |
| Allen, Ill.      | Gross           | Reed, N. Y.     |
| Andersen,        | Hall,           | Rees, Kans.     |
| H. Carl          | Leonard W.      | Robeson         |
| Anderson, Calif. | Harden          | Rogers, Mass.   |
| Andresen,        | Harvey          | Sadlak          |
| August H.        | Hess            | St. George      |
| Armstrong        | Hill            | Schwabe         |
| Ayres            | Hillings        | Scrivner        |
| Baker            | Hinshaw         | Scudder         |
| Bates, Mass.     | Hoeven          | Secrest         |
| Beall            | Hoffman, Mich.  | Shafer          |
| Beamer           | Holmes          | Sheehan         |
| Belcher          | Horan           | Short           |
| Bennett, Mich.   | Hull            | Simpson, Ill.   |
| Berry            | Jackson, Calif. | Simpson, Pa.    |
| Betts            | James           | Smith, Va.      |
| Bishop           | Jenison         | Smith, Wis.     |
| Blackney         | Jenkins         | Springer        |
| Bow              | Jensen          | Stanley         |
| Bramblett        | Jonas           | Stockman        |
| Bray             | Kearns          | Taber           |
| Brown, Ohio      | Kilburn         | Talle           |
| Brownson         | Latham          | Thompson,       |
| Budge            | LeCompte        | Mich.           |
| Buffett          | Lovre           | Towe            |
| Bush             | McConnell       | Vall            |
| Butler           | McCulloch       | Van Pelt        |
| Byrnes, Wis.     | McDonough       | Van Zandt       |
| Chenoweth        | McGregor        | Velde           |
| Chiperfield      | McVey           | Vorys           |
| Church           | Mack, Wash.     | Vursell         |
| Clevenger        | Martin, Iowa    | Weichel         |
| Cole, Kans.      | Martin, Mass.   | Werdel          |
| Colmer           | Mason           | Wharton         |
| Crawford         | Meader          | Wlgglesworth    |
| Crumacker        | Miller, Md.     | Williams, Miss. |
| Cunningham       | Miller, Nebr.   | Williams, N. Y. |
| Curtis, Nebr.    | Morano          | Wilson, Ind.    |
| Davis, Ga.       | Nicholson       | Winstead        |
| Davis, Wis.      | O'Hara          | Withrow         |
| Devereux         | O'Konski        | Wolcott         |
| D'Ewart          | Ostertag        | Wood, Idaho     |
| Dolliver         | Phillips        |                 |
| Elston           | Polk            |                 |

NAYS—245

|               |              |             |
|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| Addonizio     | Bentsen      | Carlyle     |
| Albert        | Blatnik      | Carnahan    |
| Allen, La.    | Boggs, Del.  | Case        |
| Andrews       | Bolling      | Celler      |
| Anfuso        | Bolton       | Chelf       |
| Aspinall      | Bonner       | Chudoff     |
| Auchincloss   | Bosone       | Clemente    |
| Bailey        | Boykin       | Cole, N. Y. |
| Bakewell      | Brown, Ga.   | Combs       |
| Barden        | Bryson       | Cooley      |
| Baring        | Buckley      | Cooper      |
| Barrett       | Burleson     | Corbett     |
| Bates, Ky.    | Burnside     | Cotton      |
| Battle        | Burton       | Coudert     |
| Beckworth     | Byrne, N. Y. | Cox         |
| Bender        | Canfield     | Crosser     |
| Bennett, Fla. | Cannon       | Dague       |

|                |                |               |
|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Davis, Tenn.   | Jones, Ala.    | Pickett       |
| Dawson         | Jones, Mo.     | Poage         |
| Deane          | Jones,         | Preston       |
| DeGraffenried  | Hamilton C.    | Price         |
| Delaney        | Jones,         | Priest        |
| Dempsey        | Woodrow W.     | Prouty        |
| Denny          | Judd           | Quinn         |
| Dollinger      | Karsten, Mo.   | Rabaut        |
| Donohue        | Kean           | Radwan        |
| Donovan        | Kearney        | Rains         |
| Doughton       | Keating        | Reams         |
| Doyle          | Kee            | Redden        |
| Eberharter     | Kelly, N. Y.   | Rhodes        |
| Elliot         | Kennedy        | Ribicoff      |
| Engle          | Keogh          | Richards      |
| Evins          | Kerr           | Riehlman      |
| Fallon         | Kersten, Wis.  | Riley         |
| Felghan        | Kilday         | Rivers        |
| Fernandez      | King           | Roberts       |
| Fine           | Kirwan         | Rodino        |
| Fisher         | Klein          | Rogers, Colo. |
| Flood          | Kluczynski     | Rogers, Fla.  |
| Fogarty        | Lane           | Rogers, Tex.  |
| Forand         | Lanham         | Rooney        |
| Ford           | Lantaff        | Roosevelt     |
| Forrester      | Larcade        | Sabath        |
| Frazier        | Lesinski       | Sasscer       |
| Fugate         | Lind           | Scott, Hardie |
| Fulton         | Lucas          | Scott,        |
| Furcolo        | Lyle           | Hugh D., Jr.  |
| Garmatz        | McCarthy       | Seely-Brown   |
| Gary           | McCormack      | Shelley       |
| Gathings       | McGrath        | Sheppard      |
| George         | McGuire        | Sieminski     |
| Gordon         | McKinnon       | Sikes         |
| Graham         | McMillan       | Sittler       |
| Granahan       | McMullen       | Smith, Miss.  |
| Granger        | Machrowicz     | Spence        |
| Grant          | Mack, Ill.     | Staggers      |
| Green          | Madden         | Steed         |
| Greenwood      | Magee          | Stefan        |
| Gregory        | Mahon          | Stigler       |
| Hagen          | Mansfield      | Sutton        |
| Hale           | Marshall       | Taylor        |
| Hand           | Merrow         | Teague        |
| Hardy          | Miller, Calif. | Thomas        |
| Harris         | Mills          | Thornberry    |
| Hart           | Mitchell       | Tollefson     |
| Havenner       | Morgan         | Trimble       |
| Hays, Ark.     | Morris         | Vaughn        |
| Hays, Ohio     | Morrison       | Vinson        |
| Hebert         | Morton         | Walter        |
| Hedrick        | Moulder        | Watts         |
| Heffernan      | Multer         | Welch         |
| Heller         | Mumma          | Wheeler       |
| Herlong        | Murdock        | Whitaker      |
| Herter         | Nelson         | Whitten       |
| Heselson       | Norrell        | Wickersham    |
| Holifield      | O'Brien, Ill.  | Widnall       |
| Hope           | O'Neill        | Willis        |
| Howell         | O'Toole        | Willson, Tex. |
| Hunter         | Passman        | Wolverton     |
| Jackson, Wash. | Patman         | Yates         |
| Jarman         | Patten         | Yorty         |
| Javits         | Patterson      | Zablocki      |
| Johnson        | Philbin        |               |

NOT VOTING—47

|             |                |                |
|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| Angell      | Eaton          | Murphy         |
| Arends      | Ellsworth      | Murray, Tenn.  |
| Boggs, La.  | Gavin          | Murray, Wls.   |
| Breen       | Gillette       | Norblad        |
| Brehm       | Gore           | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Brooks      | Gossett        | Perkins        |
| Burdick     | Gwinn          | Powell         |
| Busbey      | Hall,          | Ramsay         |
| Camp        | Edwin Arthur   | Regan          |
| Chatham     | Halleck        | Saylor         |
| Curtis, Mo. | Harrison, Va.  | Smith, Kans.   |
| Denton      | Harrison, Wyo. | Tackett        |
| Dingell     | Hoffman, Ill.  | Thompson, Tex. |
| Dondero     | Irving         | Wier           |
| Dorn        | Kelley, Pa.    | Wood, Ga.      |
| Durham      | Miller, N. Y.  | Woodruff       |

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Busbey for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Tackett against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Perkins against.

Mr. Harrison of Virginia for, with Mr. Durham against.

Mr. Curtis of Missouri for, with Mr. Thompson against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. O'Brien of Michigan against.

Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Denton against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Camp against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Angell with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Smith of Kansas with Mr. Murray of Tennessee.

Mr. Gillette with Mr. Ramsay.

Mr. Harrison of Wyoming with Mr. Dingell.

Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Irving.

Mr. Miller of New York with Mr. Brooks.

Mr. Norblad with Mr. Wood.

Mr. Saylor with Mr. Wier.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Chatham.

Mr. Gavin with Mr. Regan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

[Mr. ROONEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON H. R. 1105

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a committee report on the bill H. R. 1105, and that the minority may have a like privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXEMPTION OF ADMISSION TAX TO UNIFORMED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4601) to provide that the admission tax shall not apply in respect of admissions free of charge of uniformed members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is simply confined to the Armed Forces?

PURPOSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes. This bill would exempt from admissions tax members of the Armed Forces of the United



then State Engineer Edward Hyatt and other leaders in the water field, were criticized as impractical dreamers, and it was predicted the project would never be a reality. Today their vision and their efforts are applauded by hundreds of thousands of Californians who are becoming increasingly conscious of their vital but limited water supplies.

Because this event is of national significance, and because the project has attracted worldwide interest, I am pleased to include for the Record an editorial entitled "The Water Dream Materializes," from the Sacramento Bee of July 9, 1951.

#### WATER DREAM MATERIALIZES

Gov. Earl Warren has proclaimed the period from August 1 to 10 as Central Valley Water Festival Days.

It will mark the passage of Sacramento River water through the West Side canal into the San Joaquin Valley, the first time this dream of many years' standing will be realized.

During the 10-day festival, cities and towns plan celebrations along the route the water will travel.

And they certainly have good cause.

Governor Warren aptly summed up the situation when he said in his proclamation:

"It (the project) involves the longest mass movement of water ever achieved by man.

"The project is one of the greatest advances that has been made in the history of our State.

"It gives up new hope as we enter our second century of statehood, a century in which we know our continued growth will require the conservation of every drop of water that falls in our State for every useful purpose water can serve."

And he went on to say California is completely dependent upon water development. No one will question that statement.

Without water development, this State would be the barren wilderness which her discoverers found more than 100 years ago.

And her maximum growth cannot be achieved until man has made wise use of every drop of water within California's borders.

That is what the Central Valley project is seeking to accomplish.

And it is well that this milestone in the progress toward that goal should be celebrated.

#### Phillips Amendment to State Department Appropriation Bill

SPEECH  
OF

HON. SAMUEL W. YORTY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1951

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that what is involved in this amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is actually an attempt to change our constitutional form of government into a parliamentary govern-

ment, the type of government which they have in England. The gentleman is trying to make the Secretary of State directly responsible to the Congress, as would be the case in any of those countries which follow the parliamentary system of government. Under that system the cabinet members are members of parliament and the cabinet is responsible directly to parliament which can remove it by a "no confidence" vote. But under our constitutional system the correct way to remove a cabinet officer, if he should be removed, is through impeachment proceedings. The President of the United States is elected directly in this country and this amendment actually, shorn of subterfuge, is an attack upon the constitutional powers and prerogatives of the President of the United States. It is part of the political campaign of next year. Two of the gentlemen from the Republican Party in speaking for the amendment have referred to polls which they say indicate that Secretary Acheson is unpopular and should be removed from office. But the people polled were not asked if they would resort to unconstitutional means to remove him. These gentlemen, in referring to polls and asserting that polls show Mr. Acheson is unpopular—those gentlemen should remember that polls have been wrong before. I do not think the Republican Party ought to be relying too much on polls right now, after what has happened to them in the past. We want neither the parliamentary form of government substituted for our constitutional system by appropriation statutes, nor government by polls. This proposed amendment is bad irrespective of your opinion of the Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but say that we have been very careful this afternoon to insist upon strict compliance with our rules of procedure so as not to personally offend one another. And this in spite of the fact that we are here to defend ourselves. We can get up and refute any statement or charge which we do not like. But the Secretary of State is not here, and some of the cruelest, meanest things that could be said have been said about him while he cannot be here to defend himself. It is easy but cowardly and inconsistent to demand that we treat each other respectfully while permitting some of our members to personally attack the Secretary of State from the comfortable and safe well of the House where charges or accusations cannot be made the basis of a suit for slander or libel.

#### LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or

documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

#### DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator, 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily Record, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

#### GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized book dealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by book dealers, and he may designate any Government officer, his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

#### RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Ralph L. Harris is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the Record at \$1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

#### PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).















82D CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 4740

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1        *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2        *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3        That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4        in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-  
5        ments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for  
6        the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely:



## 1 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

## 2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses of the Department of State not  
4 otherwise provided for, including expenses authorized by the  
5 Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–  
6 1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National  
7 Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Coopera-  
8 tion as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the Act of July  
9 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r); expenses of at-  
10 tendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for  
11 under this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles;  
12 maintenance and operation of aircraft outside the con-  
13 tinental United States; printing and binding outside the con-  
14 tinental United States without regard to section 11 of the  
15 Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as author-  
16 ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.  
17 55a); purchase of uniforms; insurance of official motor  
18 vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of  
19 such countries; dues for library membership in organi-  
20 zations which issue publications to members only, or  
21 to members at a price lower than to others; rental of tie  
22 lines and teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by  
23 contract, for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously  
24 charged and paid for passports; establishment, maintenance,  
25 and operation of passport and despatch agencies; examina-



tion of estimates of appropriations in the field; ice and drinking water for use abroad; excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; loss by exchange; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; relief, protection, and burial of American seamen, and alien seamen in foreign countries and in the United States Territories and possessions; expenses incurred in acknowledging services of officers and crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing American seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or other catastrophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining in Egypt, Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court, and care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical information, (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids, (4) maintenance, improvement, and repair of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries, including minor construction on Government-owned properties, (5) fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased



1 property abroad, and (6) rental or lease, for periods not  
2 exceeding ten years, of offices, buildings, grounds, and living  
3 quarters for the use of the Foreign Service, for which pay-  
4 ments may be made in advance; \$73,000,000: *Provided*,  
5 That not less than \$10,000,000 of this appropriation shall be  
6 used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or  
7 owned by the Treasury of the United States for carrying out  
8 the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That  
9 pursuant to section 201 (c) of the Act of June 30, 1949  
10 (41 U. S. C. 231c), passenger motor vehicles in possession  
11 of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold  
12 and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall  
13 be available without fiscal year limitation for replacement  
14 of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including  
15 the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not  
16 exceed \$3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile  
17 at each diplomatic mission and \$1,400 in the case of all other  
18 such vehicles except station wagons.

19 REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

20 For representation allowances as authorized by sec-  
21 tion 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.  
22 S. C. 1131), \$675,000.

23 ACQUISITION OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

24 For carrying into effect the Act of July 25, 1946  
25 (22 U. S. C. 295b), including the initial alterations, re-



1 pair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said Act,  
2 \$8,000,000, which is exclusively for expenditure under the  
3 provisions of said Act which relate to payments representing  
4 the value of foreign property or credits: *Provided*, That,  
5 when specifically authorized by the Secretary of State or  
6 such Assistant Secretary as he may designate, section 6 of  
7 the Act of May 7, 1926, may be construed as including  
8 leaseholds of not less than ten years.

9 EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR

10 SERVICE

11 For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of  
12 State to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Dip-  
13 lomatic and Consular Service, to be expended pursuant to  
14 the requirement of section 291 of the Revised Statutes (31  
15 U. S. C. 107), \$9,900,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary  
16 of State may delegate to subordinate officials the authority  
17 vested in him by section 291 of the Revised Statutes pertain-  
18 ing to certification of expenditures.

19 CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

20 For expenses necessary to meet annual obligations to  
21 international organizations, the Government of Panama, and  
22 Gorgas Memorial Institute, pursuant to treaties, conventions,  
23 or specific Acts of Congress, \$27,000,000: *Provided*, That  
24 the Department of State, when requested by the United  
25 Nations, is authorized to acquire surplus property for the



1 United Nations in accordance with existing surplus property  
2 disposal laws and regulations, and the contribution of the  
3 United States to the United Nations shall be reduced by  
4 the value of the surplus property and necessary expenses,  
5 including transportation costs, incidental to the acquisition  
6 thereof.

7            MISSIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

8            For expenses necessary for permanent representation to  
9 certain international organizations in which the United States  
10 participates pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific  
11 Acts of Congress, including expenses authorized by the  
12 pertinent Acts and Conventions providing for such repre-  
13 sentation; attendance at meetings of societies or associations  
14 concerned with the work of the organizations; salaries, ex-  
15 penses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as  
16 authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended  
17 (22 U. S. C. 801-1158) ; purchase (not to exceed one,  
18 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;  
19 printing and binding, without regard to section 11 of the  
20 Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111) ; and purchase  
21 of uniforms for guards and chauffeurs, \$1,400,000:  
22 *Provided*, That the provisions of section 8 of the United  
23 Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, and regula-  
24 tions thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant



1 to that Act, may be applicable to the obligation and expendi-  
2 ture of funds in connection with United States participation  
3 in the International Civil Aviation Organization.

#### 4 INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES

5 For necessary expenses of participation by the United  
6 States upon approval by the Secretary of State, in inter-  
7 national activities which arise from time to time in the  
8 conduct of foreign affairs and for which specific appropria-  
9 tions have not been provided pursuant to treaties, conven-  
10 tions, or special Acts of Congress, including personal services  
11 without regard to civil-service and classification laws; salaries,  
12 expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as  
13 authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended  
14 (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); employment of aliens; travel ex-  
15 penses without regard to the Standardized Government  
16 Travel Regulations and without regard to the rates of per  
17 diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the  
18 Travel Expense Act of 1949; not to exceed \$15 per diem  
19 in lieu of subsistence for persons serving without compen-  
20 sation in an advisory capacity while away from their homes  
21 or regular places of business; rent of quarters by contract  
22 or otherwise; hire of passenger motor vehicles; con-  
23 tributions for the share of the United States in expenses of  
24 international organizations; and printing and binding without  
25 regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44



1 U. S. C. 111) ; \$2,600,000, of which not to exceed  
2 a total of \$100,000 may be expended for representation  
3 allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Act of  
4 August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131) and for entertainment.

5 INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,  
6 UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

7 For expenses necessary to enable the United States to  
8 meet its obligations under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905,  
9 1906, 1933, and 1944 between the United States and  
10 Mexico, and to comply with the other laws applicable to  
11 the United States Section, International Boundary and  
12 Water Commission, United States and Mexico, including  
13 operation and maintenance of the Rio Grande rectification,  
14 canalization, flood control, bank protection, boundary fence,  
15 and sanitation projects; detailed plan preparation and con-  
16 struction (including surveys and operation and maintenance  
17 and protection during construction) ; Rio Grande emergency  
18 flood protection; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles  
19 for replacement only; purchase of planographs and litho-  
20 graphs; and leasing of private property to remove therefrom  
21 sand, gravel, stone, and other materials, without regard to  
22 section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41  
23 U. S. C. 5) ; as follows:



## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses, regular boundary activities, including examinations, preliminary surveys, and investigations, \$900,000.

## CONSTRUCTION

For detailed plan preparation and construction of projects authorized by the Convention concluded February 1, 1933, between the United States and Mexico, the Acts approved August 19, 1935, as amended (22 U. S. C. 277-277f), August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 961), June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1463), June 28, 1941 (22 U. S. C. 277f), September 13, 1950 (Public Law 786), and the projects stipulated in the treaty between the United States and Mexico signed at Washington on February 3, 1944, \$14,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for the lower Rio Grande flood-control project for construction on any land, site, or easement in connection with this project except such as has been acquired by donation and the title thereto has been approved by the Attorney General of the United States: *Provided further*, That expenditures for the Rio Grande bank-protection proj-



1 ect shall be subject to the provisions and conditions con-  
2 tained in the appropriation for said project as provided  
3 by the Act approved April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 89) : *Pro-*  
4 *vided further*, That unexpended balances of appropriations  
5 for construction under the International Boundary and  
6 Water Commission available for the next preceding fiscal  
7 year shall be merged with this appropriation and shall  
8 continue available until expended.

9 RIO GRANDE EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION

10 For emergency flood-control work, including protection,  
11 reconstruction, and repair of all structures under the juris-  
12 diction of the International Boundary and Water Com-  
13 mission, United States and Mexico, threatened or damaged  
14 by floodwaters of the Rio Grande, which have heretofore  
15 been authorized and erected under the provisions of treaties  
16 between the United States and Mexico, or in pursuance of  
17 Federal laws authorizing improvements on the Rio Grande,  
18 \$30,000, to be merged with the unobligated balance of the  
19 appropriation for this purpose for the next preceding fiscal  
20 year, and to remain available until expended.

21 AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

22 For expenses necessary to enable the President to per-  
23 form the obligations of the United States pursuant to con-  
24 ventions between the United States and Canada signed  
25 May 26, 1930 (50 Stat. 1355) and January 29, 1937



1 (50 Stat. 1351), treaties between the United States and  
2 Great Britain, in respect to Canada, signed January 11,  
3 1909 (36 Stat. 2448) and February 24, 1925 (44 Stat.  
4 2102), the treaty between the United States and Canada  
5 signed February 27, 1950, and Convention between the  
6 United States and Costa Rica signed May 31, 1949, including  
7 stenographic reporting services by contract; hire of passenger  
8 motor vehicles; the United States share of the expenses of  
9 the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, the  
10 International Fisheries Commission, and the Inter-American  
11 Tropical Tuna Commission, which except for the expenses  
12 of the members, may be advanced to the respective Com-  
13 missions; \$702,000, to be disbursed under the direction of  
14 the Secretary of State and to be available also for addi-  
15 tional expenses of the American Sections, International  
16 Commissions, as hereinafter set forth:

17 International Joint Commission, United States and  
18 Canada, the salary of one Commissioner on the part of the  
19 United States who shall serve at the pleasure of the Presi-  
20 dent (the other Commissioners to serve in that capacity  
21 without compensation therefor) ; salaries of clerks and other  
22 employees appointed by the Commissioners on the part of  
23 the United States with the approval solely of the Secretary  
24 of State; travel expenses and compensation of witnesses in  
25 attending hearings of the Commission at such places in the



1 United States and Canada as the Commission or the Ameri-  
2 can Commissioners shall determine to be necessary; and  
3 special and technical investigations in connection with mat-  
4 ters falling within the Commission's jurisdiction: *Provided*,  
5 That the Secretary of State is authorized to transfer to any  
6 department or independent establishment of the Government,  
7 with the consent of the head thereof, funds from this appro-  
8 priation for direct expenditure by such department or estab-  
9 lishment for such investigations.

10 International Boundary Commission, United States,  
11 Alaska, and Canada, the completion of such remaining work  
12 as may be required under the award of the Alaskan Bound-  
13 ary Tribunal and the existing treaties between the United  
14 States and Great Britain; commutation of subsistence to em-  
15 ployees while on field duty, not to exceed \$6 per day each  
16 (but not to exceed \$3 per day each when a member of a  
17 field party and subsisting in camp) ; hire of freight and pas-  
18 senger motor vehicles from temporary field employees; and  
19 payment for timber necessarily cut in keeping the boundary  
20 line clear.

21 INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

22 For expenses necessary to enable the Commission to  
23 settle certain claims of the Government of the United States  
24 on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals  
25 against foreign governments as authorized by Public Law



1 455, approved March 10, 1950, including expenses of attend-  
2 ance at meetings of organizations concerned with the pur-  
3 pose of this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles  
4 for field use only; services as authorized by section 15 of  
5 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; and employ-  
6 ment of aliens; \$150,000.

7 INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL  
8 ACTIVITIES

9 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of  
10 State to carry out international information and educational  
11 activities as authorized by the United States Information  
12 and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U. S. C. 1431-  
13 1479) and the Act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 501),  
14 and to administer the programs authorized by section 32 (b)  
15 (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50  
16 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b) ), the Act of August 24, 1949 (20  
17 U. S. C. 222-224), and the Act of September 29, 1950  
18 (Public Law 861), including employment, without regard  
19 to the civil-service and classification laws, of (1) persons on  
20 a temporary basis (not to exceed \$120,000), (2) aliens  
21 within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service  
22 in the United States relating to the translation or narration  
23 of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be  
24 investigated for such employment in accordance with pro-  
25 cedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney



1 General) ; travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for  
2 service in the United States and dependents to and from the  
3 United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of per-  
4 sonnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service  
5 Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158) ; expenses  
6 of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided  
7 for under this appropriation (not to exceed \$8,000) ; enter-  
8 tainment within the United States (not to exceed \$5,000) ;  
9 hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of space in foreign  
10 language publications abroad, without regard to the pro-  
11 visions of law set forth in 44 U. S. C. 322; services as au-  
12 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
13 U. S. C. 55a) ; advance of funds notwithstanding section  
14 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; actual expenses  
15 of preparing and transporting to their former homes  
16 the remains of persons, not United States Government em-  
17 ployees, who may die away from their homes while par-  
18 ticipating in activities authorized under this appropriation ;  
19 establishment and operation of agricultural and other experi-  
20 ment and demonstration stations in other American countries,  
21 on land acquired by gift or lease, and construction of neces-  
22 sary buildings thereon; radio activities and acquisition and  
23 production of motion pictures and visual materials and pur-  
24 chase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor,  
25 narration, script-writing, translation, and engineering serv-



ices, by contract or otherwise; and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; \$85,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 may be used for representation abroad: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is authorized in making contracts for the use of the international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of leasehold interests payments may be made in advance for the entire term or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 per centum of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of motion-picture films.



## PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1949, \$3,000,000, to be consolidated with appropriations heretofore made under said head; and the unobligated balance of such consolidated appropriation shall remain available during the current fiscal year upon the terms and conditions specified under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1950, for expenses of liquidation of activities in the Philippines carried out pursuant to section 302 (a) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1782, 1791 (e)), and for carrying out the purposes of section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as authorized by section 3 of the Act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 882).

## GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SEC. 102. Contracts entered into in foreign countries involving expenditures from any of the appropriations under this title shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22).

SEC. 103. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate



1 the employment of any officer or employee of the Department  
2 of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States  
3 whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or  
4 advisable in the interests of the United States.

5 SEC. 104. The exchange of funds for payment of ex-  
6 penses in connection with the operation of diplomatic and  
7 consular establishments abroad shall not be subject to the  
8 provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31  
9 U. S. C. 543).

10 SEC. 105. Appropriations under this title available for  
11 expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the  
12 continental United States, including travel of dependents and  
13 transportation of personal effects, household goods, or auto-  
14 mobiles of such personnel, shall be available for such ex-  
15 penses when any part of such travel or transportation begins  
16 in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in  
17 that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or  
18 transportation may not be completed during the current fiscal  
19 year.

20 SEC. 106. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 16a  
21 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78 (a) ), Govern-  
22 ment-owned vehicles may be used in foreign countries for  
23 transportation of United States Government employees from  
24 their residence to the office and return when public trans-



1 portation facilities are unsafe or are not available: *Provided*,  
2 That each Chief of Mission shall have prior authority from  
3 the Secretary of State to approve such transportation.

4 SEC. 107. During the current fiscal year and when pur-  
5 chases are made with foreign currencies, the Department of  
6 State is authorized to purchase for use abroad any passenger  
7 motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station  
8 wagons), at a cost of not to exceed the equivalent of \$2,200  
9 for each such vehicle.

10 SEC. 108. Appropriations under this title for "Sala-  
11 ries and expenses", "International contingencies", and  
12 "Missions to international organizations" are available for  
13 reimbursement of the General Services Administration for  
14 security guard services for protection of confidential files.

15 This title may be cited as the "Department of State  
16 Appropriation Act, 1952".

## 17 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### 18 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

#### 19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

20 For expenses necessary for the administration of the  
21 Department of Justice and for examination of judicial offices,  
22 including purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for re-  
23 placement only; miscellaneous and emergency expenses  
24 authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his  
25 Administrative Assistant; special attorneys and special as-



1 sistants to the Attorney General; and examination of esti-  
 2 mates of appropriations in the field; \$2,250,000.

### 3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

4 For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the  
 5 Department of Justice not otherwise provided for, including  
 6 miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or ap-  
 7 proved by the Attorney General or his Administrative  
 8 Assistant; and advances of public moneys pursuant to law  
 9 (31 U. S. C. 529) ; \$9,032,000.

### 10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

11 For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust  
 12 and kindred laws, \$3,200,000, of which \$125,000 shall be  
 13 available exclusively for activities in connection with rail-  
 14 road reparations cases: *Provided*, That none of this appro-  
 15 priation shall be expended for the establishment and mainte-  
 16 nance of permanent regional offices of the Antitrust Division.

### 17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

#### 18 AND MARSHALS

19 For necessary expenses of the offices of United States  
 20 attorneys and marshals and United States district attorneys  
 21 in Alaska, including purchase of not to exceed two passenger  
 22 motor vehicles (one van for replacement only at not to  
 23 exceed \$2,500, and one bus for replacement only at not to  
 24 exceed \$15,000) ; services in Alaska in collecting evidence  
 25 for the United States when specifically directed by the



1 Attorney General; and firearms and ammunition; \$12,990,-  
2 000, of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for  
3 the employment of temporary deputy marshals in lieu of  
4 bailiffs at a rate not to exceed \$10 per day.

5 FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

6 For expenses, mileage, and per diems of witnesses and  
7 for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law;  
8 and not to exceed \$160,000 for such compensation and  
9 expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses) or infor-  
10 mants pursuant to section 1 of Public Law 626, approved  
11 July 28, 1950; \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the  
12 sum herein appropriated shall be used to pay any witness  
13 more than one attendance fee for any one calendar day.

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF  
15 JAPANESE ANCESTRY

16 For expenses necessary for payment of claims of persons  
17 of Japanese ancestry, pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948  
18 (50 U. S. C. 1981-1987), \$725,000, of which not to  
19 exceed \$225,000 shall be available for administrative  
20 expenses.

21 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For expenses necessary for the detection and prosecu-  
24 tion of crimes against the United States; protection of the  
25 person of the President of the United States; acquisition,

1 collection, classification and preservation of identification  
2 and other records and their exchange with the duly author-  
3 ized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities,  
4 and other institutions; and such other investigations regard-  
5 ing official matters under the control of the Department of  
6 Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by  
7 the Attorney General, including purchase (not to exceed  
8 four hundred for replacement only) and hire of passenger  
9 motor vehicles; purchase at not to exceed \$10,000, for  
10 replacement only, of one armored motor vehicle; firearms  
11 and ammunition; not to exceed \$150,000 for repairs and  
12 alterations at the Federal Bureau of Investigation Training  
13 Center, Quantico, Virginia; not to exceed \$10,000 for taxi-  
14 cab hire to be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in  
15 this paragraph; not to exceed \$4,500 for expenses of  
16 attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the  
17 purposes of this appropriation; payment of rewards when  
18 specifically authorized by the Attorney General for infor-  
19 mation leading to the apprehension of fugitives from justice;  
20 and not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies  
21 of a confidential character, to be expended under the direc-  
22 tion of the Attorney General and to be accounted for  
23 solely on his certificate; \$90,000,000: *Provided*, That  
24 of the amount herein appropriated \$100,000 is to be  
25 held as a reserve for emergencies arising in connection with



1 kidnapping, extortion, and bank robbery, to be released for  
2 expenditure in such amounts and at such times as the Attor-  
3 ney General may determine: *Provided further*, That the  
4 compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be \$20,000  
5 per annum so long as the position is held by the present  
6 incumbent.

7       None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau  
8 of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of  
9 any civil-service employee.

10       IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

11               SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12       For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
13 the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to  
14 immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, includ-  
15 ing advance of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while en  
16 route; payment of allowances (at a rate not in excess of  
17 \$1 per day) to aliens, while held in custody under the  
18 immigration laws, for work performed; payment of rewards  
19 for information leading to the apprehension or conviction  
20 of violators of the immigration laws; not to exceed  
21 \$35,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential  
22 character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney  
23 General and accounted for solely on his certificate; not to  
24 exceed \$5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of  
25 organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropria-

1 tion; purchase (not to exceed one hundred and fifty for  
2 replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;  
3 purchase (not to exceed four for replacement only) and  
4 maintenance and operation of aircraft; firearms and ammu-  
5 nition; refunds of head tax, maintenance bills, immigra-  
6 tion fines, and other items properly returnable, except  
7 deposits of aliens who become public charges and de-  
8 posits to secure payment of fines and passage money;  
9 operation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of build-  
10 ings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto;  
11 reimbursement of the General Services Administration for  
12 security guard services for protection of confidential files;  
13 and maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and  
14 transportation of alien enemies and their wives and de-  
15 pendent children, including return of such persons to place  
16 of bona fide residence or to such other place as may  
17 be authorized by the Attorney General; \$36,400,000.

## 18 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

### 19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

20 For expenses necessary for the administration, opera-  
21 tion, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional  
22 institutions, including not to exceed \$490,000 for depart-  
23 mental personal services; not to exceed \$13,500 for expenses  
24 of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with  
25 the purposes of this appropriation; purchase of not to exceed



1 fourteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only,  
2 including two busses at not to exceed \$20,000 each; com-  
3 pilation of statistics relating to prisoners in Federal and  
4 non-Federal penal and correctional institutions; furnishing  
5 of insignia, uniforms, and other distinctive wearing apparel  
6 necessary for employees in the performance of their official  
7 duties; payment pursuant to law of claims of employees for  
8 loss, damage, or destruction of personal property (31  
9 U. S. C. 238); firearms and ammunition; payment of  
10 rewards for the apprehension, or for information leading to  
11 the recapture, of escaped prisoners; purchase and exchange  
12 of farm products and livestock; construction of buildings at  
13 prison camps; and acquisition of land as authorized by  
14 section 7 of the Act of July 28, 1950 (Public Law 626);  
15 \$23,500,000: *Provided*, That there may be transferred to  
16 the Public Health Service such amounts as may be necessary,  
17 in the discretion of the Attorney General, for direct expendi-  
18 ture by that Service for medical relief for inmates of Federal  
19 penal and correctional institutions.

20 BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

21 For constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary  
22 buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional  
23 institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto,  
24 by contract or force account, \$470,000, of which \$360,000  
25 is for liquidation of authority granted under this head in

1 the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1950, to enter  
2 into contracts for replacement of a power plant at the  
3 United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas: *Pro-*  
4 *vided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used  
5 for work performed under this appropriation.

6 SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

7 For support of United States prisoners in non-Federal  
8 institutions and in the Territory of Alaska, including neces-  
9 sary clothing and medical aid, and payment of rewards for  
10 the apprehension, or for information leading to the recap-  
11 ture, of escaped prisoners; \$2,000,000.

12 OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 The Attorney General, or such officer as he may desig-  
15 nate, is hereby authorized to pay out of any funds or other  
16 property or interest vested in him or transferred to him  
17 pursuant to or with respect to the Trading with the Enemy  
18 Act of October 6, 1917, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.),  
19 necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the powers and  
20 duties conferred on the Attorney General pursuant to said  
21 Act: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,600,000 shall be  
22 available in the current fiscal year for the general adminis-  
23 trative expenses of the Office of Alien Property, including  
24 rent of private or Government-owned space in the District



1 of Columbia; purchase of not to exceed one passenger  
2 motor vehicle for replacement only; and expenses of at-  
3 tendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the  
4 purposes of this authorization: *Provided further*, That on  
5 or before November 1 of the current fiscal year, the At-  
6 torney General shall make a report to the Appropriations  
7 Committees of the Senate and the House of Representa-  
8 tives giving detailed information on all administrative  
9 and nonadministrative expenses incurred during the next  
10 preceding fiscal year in connection with the activities of the  
11 Office of Alien Property: *Provided further*, That of the  
12 total amount herein authorized the amount of \$100,000 is  
13 to be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and  
14 expenses, general administration", Department of Justice.

15 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

• 16 SEC. 202. Not to exceed \$350,000 in the aggregate  
17 from the appropriations made in this title for general ad-  
18 ministration, general legal activities, and United States at-  
19 torneys and marshals shall be available, without regard to  
20 the Classification Act of 1949, for compensation (not to  
21 exceed \$11,000 per annum) of special attorneys and special  
22 assistants to the Attorney General and to United States  
23 attorneys not otherwise provided for: *Provided*, That re-  
24 ports be submitted to the Congress on the 1st of July and  
25 January showing the names of the persons employed under

1 the foregoing limitation, the annual rate of compensation  
2 or amount of any fee paid to each, together with a descrip-  
3 tion of their duties.

4 SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated by this title  
5 may be used to pay the compensation of any person here-  
6 after employed as an attorney (except foreign counsel em-  
7 ployed in special cases) unless such person shall be duly  
8 licensed and authorized to practice as an attorney under  
9 the laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

10 SEC. 204. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the  
11 offices of the United States attorney and the United States  
12 marshal for the District of Columbia from all appropriations  
13 in this title shall be reimbursed to the United States from  
14 any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit  
15 of the District of Columbia.

16 SEC. 205. Appropriations and authorizations made in  
17 this title which are available for expenses of attendance at  
18 meetings shall be expended for such purposes in accordance  
19 with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General.

20 SEC. 206. Appropriations and authorizations made in  
21 this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for  
22 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
23 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

24 This title may be cited as the "Department of Justice  
25 Appropriation Act, 1952".



## 1           TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## 2                           OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3           Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the  
4 Office of the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this  
5 title referred to as the Secretary) including services as  
6 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
7 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per  
8 diem; and teletype news service (not exceeding \$1,000);  
9 \$1,500,000.

10          Technical and scientific services: For expenses neces-  
11 sary for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and  
12 engineering information to business and industry as author-  
13 ized by the Act of September 9, 1950 (Public Law 776),  
14 including not to exceed \$2,000 for services as authorized  
15 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.  
16 55a), \$250,000: *Provided*, That moneys hereafter received  
17 by the Secretary pursuant to section 3 of said Act of Sep-  
18 tember 9, 1950, for publications provided thereunder, shall  
19 be available for reimbursing any appropriation as provided  
20 by said section.

## 21                           BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

22          Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Census: For ex-  
23 penses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing  
24 current census statistics provided for by law; for searching  
25 census records and supplying information with respect to age

1 and citizenship certification; and for general administration,  
2 including enumerators at rates to be fixed without regard  
3 to the Classification Act of 1949; and services as authorized  
4 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),  
5 at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem;  
6 \$6,500,000.

7       Seventeenth decennial census: For expenses necessary  
8 for taking, compiling, and publishing the seventeenth decen-  
9 nial census including the census of housing as authorized by  
10 law (13 U. S. C. 201-219; 42 U. S. C. 1442), including  
11 personal services at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of  
12 Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949;  
13 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
14 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and compensation of employees  
15 of the Department of Commerce and other departments and  
16 independent establishments of the Government who may be  
17 detailed for field work; \$7,000,000, to remain available until  
18 December 31, 1952, and to be merged with the appropriation  
19 made under this head in the Department of Commerce Ap-  
20 propriation Act 1951.

21       Censuses of business, transportation, manufactures and  
22 mineral industries: For expenses necessary to prepare for  
23 taking, compiling, and publishing the censuses of business,  
24 transportation, manufactures and mineral industries as  
25 authorized by law, including personal services by contract or



1 otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce  
2 without regard to the Classification Act of 1949; services as  
3 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
4 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per  
5 diem; and additional compensation of Federal employees tem-  
6 porarily detailed for field work under this appropriation;  
7 \$200,000, to remain available until December 31, 1953.

8 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

9 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the  
10 Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the pro-  
11 visions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended  
12 (49 U. S. C. 401), the Act of August 8, 1950 (Public  
13 Law 670), and other Acts incident to the enforcement of  
14 safety regulations; maintenance and operation of air naviga-  
15 tion facilities and air traffic control; furnishing advisory serv-  
16 ice to States and other public and private agencies in con-  
17 nection with the construction or improvement of airports  
18 and landing areas; and the disposal of surplus airports; in-  
19 cluding hire of aircraft (not exceeding \$395,000); the  
20 operation and maintenance of eighty-five aircraft; contract  
21 stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of expert  
22 and other witnesses; examination of estimates of appropria-  
23 tions in the field; purchase (not to exceed twenty, for re-  
24 placement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and  
25 purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; \$99,100,000,

1 and the Departments of the Air Force, Army and  
2 Navy are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics  
3 Administration without charge, subject to the approval of  
4 the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement only),  
5 aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment, and hangar, line,  
6 and shop equipment surplus to the needs of such Depart-  
7 ments: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appro-  
8 priation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities,  
9 and other public authorities for expenses incurred in the  
10 maintenance and operation of airport traffic control towers.

11 Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the ac-  
12 quisition and establishment by contract or purchase and hire  
13 of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of addi-  
14 tional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction  
15 of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling  
16 and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration  
17 and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; the  
18 acquisition of the necessary sites by lease, condemnation or  
19 grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related  
20 accommodations for officers and employees of the Civil Aero-  
21 nautics Administration and the Weather Bureau stationed at  
22 remote localities not on foreign soil where such accommoda-  
23 tions are not otherwise available; hire of passenger motor  
24 vehicles; and not to exceed \$200,000 for emergency repairs  
25 and replacement of facilities damaged by fire, flood, or storm;



1 to remain available until expended, \$20,000,000, of which  
2 \$12,000,000. is for liquidation of obligations incurred  
3 under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for  
4 the foregoing purposes: *Provided*, That authority hereto-  
5 fore granted under this head to enter into contracts for such  
6 purposes may be exercised until June 30, 1952 and may  
7 hereafter be accounted for under this head: *Provided further*,  
8 That the consolidated appropriation under this head for the  
9 next preceding fiscal year is hereby consolidated with and  
10 made a part of this appropriation to be disbursed and ac-  
11 counted for as one fund: *Provided further*, That transfers may  
12 be made from this appropriation to the appropriation "Sal-  
13 aries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration", for  
14 costs of maintenance and operation of aircraft for initial flight  
15 checking of facilities established under this appropriation (not  
16 to exceed \$325,000) ; for necessary expenses in connection  
17 with the transportation by air to and from and within the  
18 Territories of the United States of materials and equipment  
19 secured under this appropriation (not to exceed \$115,000) ;  
20 and for necessary administrative costs (not to exceed \$325,-  
21 000) : *Provided further*, That the Departments of the Army,  
22 Navy, and Air Force are authorized during the current fiscal  
23 year to transfer without charge, subject to the approval of  
24 the Bureau of the Budget, air-navigation and communication

1 facilities, including appurtenances thereto, to the Civil Aero-  
2 nautics Administration.

3       Technical development and evaluation: For expenses  
4 necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aero-  
5 nautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), relative  
6 to such developmental work and service testing as tends to  
7 the creation of improved air-navigation facilities, including  
8 landing areas, aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances,  
9 personnel, and operation methods; acquisition of necessary  
10 sites by lease or grant; and operation and maintenance of five  
11 aircraft, which shall be in addition to the number authorized  
12 herein under the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses,  
13 Civil Aeronautics Administration"; \$1,200,000.

14       Maintenance and operation, Washington National Air-  
15 port: For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-  
16 nance, and protection of the Washington National Airport,  
17 including purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for re-  
18 placement only; not to exceed \$3,500 for the purchase,  
19 cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition;  
20 \$1,300,000.

21       Construction, Washington National Airport: For an  
22 additional amount for construction at the Washington Na-  
23 tional Airport, \$75,000, to remain available until expended.



1       Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For  
2 carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of  
3 May 13, 1946, as amended (except section 5 (a) ), to be  
4 available until June 30, 1954, \$35,840,000, of which (1)  
5 \$17,000,000 shall be for projects in the States in accordance  
6 with section 6 of said Act, (2) \$470,000 for projects in  
7 Puerto Rico, (3) \$30,000 for projects in the Virgin Islands,  
8 (4) \$300,000 for projects in the Territory of Hawaii, (5)  
9 \$200,000 for projects in the Territory of Alaska, (6)  
10 \$15,000,000 for liquidation of obligations incurred under  
11 authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the  
12 foregoing purposes and (7) \$2,840,000 shall be available  
13 as one fund for necessary planning, research, and adminis-  
14 trative expenses; including hire of passenger motor vehicles;  
15 of which \$2,840,000 not to exceed \$500,000 may be trans-  
16 ferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil  
17 Aeronautics Administration", to provide for necessary ad-  
18 ministrative expenses, including the maintenance and opera-  
19 tion of aircraft: *Provided*, That the appropriation under this  
20 head for the next preceding fiscal year is hereby merged  
21 with this appropriation and the contract authorization here-  
22 tofore granted for the foregoing purposes may hereafter be  
23 accounted for under this head.

24       Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory

1 of Alaska: For expenses necessary for the maintenance, im-  
2 provement, and operation of public airports in the Territory  
3 of Alaska, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 485 c-h) ;  
4 including arms and ammunition; \$225,000.

5 Air navigation development: For liquidation of obliga-  
6 tions incurred under authority heretofore granted under this  
7 head to enter into contracts, \$1,883,000: *Provided*, That  
8 the appropriation granted under this head for the fiscal year  
9 1951 shall remain available during the current fiscal year  
10 and may hereafter be accounted for under this head, and not  
11 to exceed \$80,000 of such appropriation shall be available  
12 for administrative expenses.

13 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

14 Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses: For  
15 necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including  
16 contract stenographic reporting services; employment of tem-  
17 porary guards on a contract or fee basis; salaries and traveling  
18 expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training  
19 conducted by the Government or industries serving aviation;  
20 expenses of examination of estimates of appropriations in the  
21 field; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and hire, operation,  
22 maintenance, and repair of aircraft; \$3,550,000: *Provided*,  
23 That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are  
24 authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Board without



1 charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,  
2 aircraft (for replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, and  
3 accessories surplus to the needs of such Departments.

4 COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry  
6 out the provisions of the Act of August 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C.  
7 883a-883i), including purchase of not to exceed four pas-  
8 senger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of sites and  
9 the erection of temporary buildings for tide, magnetic or  
10 seismological observations; hire of aircraft; operation,  
11 maintenance, and repair of an airplane; extra compensation  
12 at not to exceed \$15 per month to each member of the  
13 crew of a vessel when assigned duties as recorder or instru-  
14 ment observer, and at not to exceed \$1 per day for each  
15 station to employees of other Federal agencies while making  
16 oceanographic observations or tending seismographs; not to  
17 exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of  
18 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; pay, allow-  
19 ances, gratuities, transportation of dependents and house-  
20 hold effects, and payment of funeral expenses, as authorized  
21 by law, for not to exceed 185 commissioned officers on the  
22 active list; and pay of commissioned officers retired in ac-  
23 cordance with law; \$12,375,000: *Provided*, That the Depart-  
24 ments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized  
25 during the current fiscal year to transfer without reimburse-

1 ment to the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to the  
2 approval of the Bureau of the Budget, landing craft, launches,  
3 marine engines, electronic equipment, automotive vehicles,  
4 parts, equipment, and supplies, excess to the needs of such  
5 Departments, which will serve to expedite surveys in Alaska  
6 for national defense: *Provided further*, That during the  
7 current fiscal year, this appropriation shall be reimbursed  
8 (to the extent and in the manner required by law (44  
9 U. S. C. 246) for charts sold to the general public) for  
10 charts published by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and  
11 furnished for the official use of the military departments of  
12 the Department of Defense.

13 BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

14 Departmental salaries and expenses: For necessary  
15 expenses of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce  
16 at the seat of government, including the purchase of com-  
17 mercial and trade reports, and not to exceed \$50,000 for  
18 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
19 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That  
20 expenses of field studies or surveys conducted by depart-  
21 mental personnel of the Bureau shall be payable from the  
22 amount herein appropriated.

23 Field office service: For expenses necessary to operate  
24 and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices



1 for the collection and dissemination of information useful in  
2 the development and improvement of commerce throughout  
3 the United States and its possessions, including not to exceed  
4 \$90,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,  
5 \$1,900,000.

6 Export control: For expenses necessary for carrying  
7 out the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949, as  
8 amended, relating to export controls, including services as  
9 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
10 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem  
11 for individuals, \$5,500,000, of which not to exceed  
12 \$1,277,000 may be transferred to the Bureau of Customs,  
13 Treasury Department, for enforcement of the export con-  
14 trol program, and of which not to exceed \$100,000 may be  
15 transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses"  
16 under the Office of the Secretary.

17 PATENT OFFICE

18 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-  
19 ing services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
20 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to  
21 exceed \$75 per diem (not to exceed \$25,000); expenses of  
22 transporting to foreign governments publications of patents  
23 issued by the Patent Office; defense of suits instituted against  
24 the Commissioner of Patents; and other contingent expenses  
25 of the Patent Office: *Provided*, That the headings of the

1 drawings for patented cases may be multigraphed in the  
2 Patent Office for the purpose of photolithography, \$11,-  
3 500,000.

#### 4 BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

5 General administrative expenses: Necessary expenses of  
6 administration, including advertising (including advertising  
7 in the city of Washington for work to be performed in areas  
8 adjacent thereto), purchase of fifty passenger motor vehicles  
9 for replacement only, and the maintenance and repairs of  
10 experimental highways, shall be paid, in accordance with  
11 law, from appropriations available to the Bureau of Public  
12 Roads.

13 Of the total amount available from appropriations of  
14 the Bureau of Public Roads for general administrative ex-  
15 penses, pursuant to the provisions of section 21 of the Act  
16 of November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 21),  
17 \$100,000 shall be available for all necessary expenses to  
18 enable the President to utilize the services of the Bureau of  
19 Public Roads in fulfilling the obligations of the United  
20 States under the Convention on the Pan-American High-  
21 way Between the United States and Other American Re-  
22 publics (51 Stat. 152), cooperation with several govern-  
23 ments, members of the Pan American Union, in connection  
24 with the survey and construction of the Inter-American  
25 Highway, and for performing engineering service in Pan-



1 American countries for and upon the request of any agency  
2 or governmental corporation of the United States.

3 Federal-aid highways: For carrying out the provisions  
4 of the Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented  
5 (23 U. S. C. 1-22, 24-105, 107-117), to remain available  
6 until expended, \$325,000,000, which sum is composed of  
7 \$320,000,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appro-  
8 priated for the fiscal year 1950, and \$3,214,713 and  
9 \$1,785,287, the latter sums being for reimbursement of the  
10 sums expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways  
11 and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by  
12 floods, hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by section 4  
13 of the Act approved June 8, 1938, and section 7 of the Act  
14 approved July 13, 1943 (23 U. S. C. 13a and 13b).

15 Elimination of grade crossings: For the elimination  
16 of hazards to life at railroad grade crossings, to remain  
17 available until expended, \$3,000,000, which sum is a part  
18 of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal  
19 year 1943 by section 5 of the Act approved September 5,  
20 1940 (54 Stat. 869): *Provided*, That the amounts author-  
21 ized for the elimination of grade crossing hazards by said  
22 section and apportioned to Hawaii are hereby reduced by  
23 \$188,075.

24 Forest highways: For expenses, not otherwise provided  
25 for, necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23

1 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as  
2 amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), to remain available  
3 until expended, \$21,000,000, which sum is composed of  
4 \$2,400,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be  
5 appropriated for the fiscal year 1950, and \$18,600,000, a  
6 part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal  
7 year 1951: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be avail-  
8 able for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of  
9 buildings and sites necessary for the storage and repair of  
10 equipment and supplies used for road construction and main-  
11 tenance, but the total cost of any such item under this author-  
12 ization shall not exceed \$15,000.

13 Tongass Forest Highways, Alaska: For surveys, con-  
14 struction, reconstruction, and maintenance of Tongass forest  
15 highways in Alaska in accordance with the provisions of  
16 section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, \$3,500,-  
17 000, to remain available until expended.

18 Access roads: During the current fiscal year, not to  
19 exceed \$70,000 of funds remaining unexpended upon com-  
20 pletion of access road projects authorized to be constructed  
21 under the provisions of the Defense Highway Act of 1941,  
22 as amended by the Act of July 2, 1942 (23 U. S. C. 106),  
23 shall be available for the maintenance of roads and bridges  
24 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Roads on  
25 Government-owned land in Arlington County, Virginia.



1        War and emergency damage, Territory of Hawaii:  
2    For the liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to  
3    authority granted under this head in the Independent Offices  
4    Appropriation Act, 1948, \$2,000,000, to remain available  
5    until expended.

6        Inter-American Highway: For necessary expenses of  
7    continuing the survey and construction of the Inter-American  
8    Highway, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of  
9    December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section  
10   11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, \$4,000,000,  
11   to remain available until expended.

12       Access roads (Act of September 7, 1950): For an  
13   additional amount for "Access roads (Act of September 7,  
14   1950)", \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

15       General provisions—Bureau of Public Roads: None of  
16   the money appropriated for the work of the Bureau of Public  
17   Roads during the current fiscal year shall be paid to any  
18   State on account of any project on which convict labor shall  
19   be employed, but this provision shall not apply to labor  
20   performed by convicts on parole or probation.

21       During the current fiscal year authorized engineering or  
22   other services in connection with the survey, construction,  
23   and maintenance, or improvement of roads may be per-  
24   formed for other Government agencies, cooperating foreign

1 countries and State cooperating agencies and reimbursement  
2 for such services (which may include depreciation on engi-  
3 neering and road-building equipment used) shall be credited  
4 to the appropriation concerned.

5 During the current fiscal year appropriations for the  
6 work of the Bureau of Public Roads shall be available for  
7 expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement,  
8 care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment  
9 for distribution to projects under the supervision of the  
10 Bureau of Public Roads, or for sale or distribution to other  
11 Government activities, cooperating foreign countries and  
12 State cooperating agencies, and the cost of such supplies  
13 and materials or the value of such equipment (including the  
14 cost of transportation and handling) may be reimbursed to  
15 current applicable appropriations.

16 Appropriations to the Bureau of Public Roads may be  
17 used in emergency for medical supplies and services and  
18 other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of em-  
19 ployees engaged on hazardous work under that Bureau, and  
20 for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the  
21 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates for  
22 individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem.

23 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

24 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions



1 of the Act approved March 3, 1901, as amended (15  
2 U. S. C. 271-278; Public Law 619, approved July 22,  
3 1950), including not to exceed \$700,000 for improvements  
4 to buildings, grounds, and other plant facilities, as author-  
5 ized by section 2 of the Act of July 21, 1950 (Public  
6 Law 618); building of temporary experimental structures;  
7 purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for  
8 replacement only; and not to exceed \$100,000 for services  
9 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
10 (5 U. S. C. 55a); as follows:

11       Operation and administration: For the general opera-  
12 tion and administration of the Bureau; improvement and  
13 care of the grounds; plant equipment; and maintenance and  
14 protection of buildings, including repairs and alterations  
15 thereto; \$1,100,000.

16       Research and testing: For research, testing and other  
17 activities, as authorized by the Act of July 22, 1950 (Public  
18 Law 619), and not otherwise provided for, \$4,000,000.

19       Radio propagation and standards: For development and  
20 maintenance of primary standards of measurement of elec-  
21 trical quantities at radio frequencies; calibrating and certify-  
22 ing radio measuring instruments, apparatus, and standards in  
23 terms of the national primary standards; investigation of the  
24 phenomena affecting the propagation of radio waves; and

1 the broadcasting of radio signals of standard frequency;  
2 \$2,800,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year  
3 the maximum base rate of compensation for employees  
4 appointed pursuant to the Act of July 21, 1950 (Public  
5 Law 618), shall be \$6,400 per annum: *Provided further*,  
6 That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force  
7 are authorized, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the  
8 Budget, to transfer without charge to the National Bureau  
9 of Standards materials, equipment, and supplies, surplus to  
10 their needs and necessary for the establishment, mainte-  
11 nance, and operation of Arctic ionosphere observation  
12 stations.

13 Construction of laboratories: For payment of obliga-  
14 tions incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head  
15 in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1951,  
16 \$3,800,000, to remain available until expended.

17 Working capital fund: For an additional amount for  
18 the "Working capital fund", established by the Deficiency  
19 Appropriation Act, 1950, \$2,000,000, to be available with-  
20 out fiscal year limitation.

21 WEATHER BUREAU

22 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
23 Weather Bureau, including maintenance and operation of air-



1 craft; not to exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized by  
2 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);  
3 not to exceed \$10,000 for maintenance of a printing office in  
4 the City of Washington, as authorized by law; and not to  
5 exceed \$10,000 for the United States contribution to the  
6 cost of the secretariat of the International Meteorological  
7 Committee; \$26,000,000: *Provided*, That during the current  
8 fiscal year, the maximum amount authorized under section 3  
9 (a) of the Act of June 2, 1948 (15 U. S. C. 327), for extra  
10 compensation to employees of other Government agencies  
11 for taking and transmitting meteorological observations, shall  
12 be \$5 per day; and the maximum base rate of pay authorized  
13 under section 3 (b) of said Act, for employees conducting  
14 meteorological investigations in the Arctic region, shall be  
15 \$5,000 per annum, except that not more than five of such  
16 employees at any one time may receive a base rate of \$7,500  
17 per annum, and such employees may be appointed without  
18 regard to the Classification Act of 1949: *Provided further*,  
19 That such sums, as may be determined by the Director of  
20 the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary, may be transferred  
21 from this appropriation to the appropriation to the Depart-  
22 ment of State for "Contributions to International Organi-  
23 zations, 1952", for contribution to the International Civil

1 Aviation Organization for the United States share of the  
2 costs of the meteorological installation in Iceland, when said  
3 installation is transferred for operation under the "Agree-  
4 ment on Air Navigation Services in Iceland".

5 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

6 SEC. 302. During the current fiscal year applicable ap-  
7 propriations and funds available to the Department of Com-  
8 merce shall be available for the activities specified in the  
9 Act of October 26, 1949 (Public Law 390), to the extent  
10 and in the manner prescribed by said Act.

11 SEC. 303. Appropriations of the Department of Com-  
12 merce available for salaries and expenses shall be avail-  
13 able for attendance at meetings of organizations concerned  
14 with the activities for which the appropriations are made.

15 SEC. 304. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6  
16 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the  
17 provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce  
18 may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal  
19 year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee  
20 of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem  
21 such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests  
22 of the United States.

23 This title may be cited as the "Department of Commerce  
24 Appropriation Act, 1952".



1                    TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY  
2                    SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
3                    SALARIES

4            For the Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices, and  
5 all other officers and employees, whose compensation shall  
6 be fixed by the Court, except as otherwise provided by law,  
7 and who may be employed and assigned by the Chief Justice  
8 to any office or work of the Court, \$928,000.

9            PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS  
10           For printing and binding the advance opinions, prelimi-  
11 nary prints, and bound reports of the Court, \$91,200.

12           MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES  
13           For miscellaneous expenses to be expended as the Chief  
14 Justice may approve, \$58,350.

15           CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS  
16           For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the  
17 Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed upon  
18 him by the Act approved May 7, 1934 (40 U. S. C.  
19 13a-13d), including improvements, maintenance, repairs,  
20 equipment, supplies, materials, and appurtenances; special  
21 clothing for workmen; and personal and other services  
22 (including temporary labor without reference to the Classi-  
23 fication and Retirement Acts, as amended), and for snow  
24 removal by hire of men and equipment or under contract  
25 without compliance with sections 3709, as amended, and

1 3744 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5, 16) ;  
2 \$160,700.

3 COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges, and  
6 all other officers and employees of the court, and necessary  
7 expenses of the court, including exchange of books, and  
8 traveling expenses, as may be approved by the chief judge,  
9 \$194,500.

10 CUSTOMS COURT

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For salaries of the chief judge, eight judges, and all other  
13 officers and employees of the court, and necessary expenses  
14 of the court, including exchange of books, and traveling  
15 expenses, as may be approved by the chief judge, \$433,165:  
16 *Provided*, That traveling expenses of judges of the Customs  
17 Court shall be paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

18 COURT OF CLAIMS

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges,  
21 seven regular and six additional commissioners, and all other  
22 officers and employees of the court, and for other necessary  
23 expenses, including stenographic and other fees and charges  
24 necessary in the taking of testimony, and travel, \$579,800.



## 1 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS

2 For necessary repairs and improvements to the Court  
3 of Claims buildings, to be expended under the supervision  
4 of the Architect of the Capitol, \$9,100.

## 5 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

## 6 HAWAII

7 For salaries of the chief justice and two associate justices  
8 of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, of judges  
9 of the circuit courts in Hawaii, and of judges retired under  
10 title 28, United States Code, section 373, \$120,000.

## 11 SALARIES OF JUDGES

For salaries of circuit judges; district judges (including judges of the district courts of Alaska, the Virgin Islands, the Panama Canal Zone, and Guam); and justices and judges retired or resigned under title 28, United States Code, sections 371, 372, and 373; \$5,120,000.

## 17 SALARIES OF CLERKS OF COURTS

18 For salaries of clerks of United States courts of appeals  
19 and United States district courts, their deputies, and other  
20 assistants, \$4,520,000.

21 PROBATION SYSTEM

For salaries of probation officers and their clerical as-  
sistants, as authorized by title 18, United States Code,  
sections 3654 and 3656, \$2,180,000: *Provided, That*  
nothing herein contained shall be construed to abridge

1 the right of the district judges to appoint probation  
2 officers, or to make such orders as may be necessary to  
3 govern probation officers in their own courts: *Provided*  
4 *further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used  
5 to pay the salary or expenses of any probation officer who,  
6 in the judgment of the chief or presiding judge certified to  
7 the Attorney General, fails to carry out the official orders  
8 of the Attorney General with respect to supervising or fur-  
9 nishing information concerning any prisoner released con-  
10 ditionally or on parole from any Federal penal or correctional  
11 institution.

#### 12 SALARIES OF CRIERS

13 For salaries of criers as authorized by title 28, United  
14 States Code, sections 713 (a) and 755, \$542,300.

#### 15 FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

16 For fees of the United States commissioners and other  
17 committing magistrates acting under title 18, United States  
18 Code, section 3041, including fees and expenses of concili-  
19 ation commissioners, United States courts, including the  
20 objects and subject to the conditions specified for such fees  
21 and expenses of conciliation commissioners in the Depart-  
22 ment of Justice Appropriation Act, 1937, \$543,000.

#### 23 FEES OF JURORS

24 For fees, expenses, and costs of jurors; meals and lodging  
25 for jurors in Alaska, as provided by section 193, title II, of



1 the Act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 362) ; and compensation  
2 for jury commissioners; \$2,800,000: *Provided*, That the  
3 compensation of jury commissioners for the District of  
4 Columbia shall conform to the provisions of section 1401,  
5 title 11 of the District of Columbia Code.

6 MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

7 For salaries of all officials and employees of the  
8 Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for,  
9 \$2,670,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secre-  
10 taries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall  
11 be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office  
12 without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, except  
13 that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the  
14 General Schedule grades (GS) 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, as the ap-  
15 pointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk  
16 shall conform with that of the General Schedule grades  
17 (GS) 5, 7, 9, 11, or 12, as the appointing judge shall deter-  
18 mine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit  
19 if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge  
20 otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of  
21 step-increases corresponding with those provided for by title  
22 VII of the Classification Act of 1949 and of compensation  
23 paid for temporary assistance needed because of an emer-  
24 gency) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law

1 clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed \$9,600 per  
2 annum, except in the case of the chief judge of each circuit  
3 and the chief judge of each district court having five or more  
4 district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not  
5 exceed \$13,050 per annum.

#### 6 MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

7 For miscellaneous expenses of the United States courts  
8 and their officers; rent in the District of Columbia; pur-  
9 chase of firearms and ammunition; and purchase of en-  
10 velopes without regard to the Act of June 26, 1906 (34  
11 Stat. 476) ; \$750,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation  
12 shall be available for payment of the cost of contract statis-  
13 tical services for the Office of Register of Wills of the District  
14 of Columbia: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000  
15 of this appropriation shall be available for the payment of  
16 fees to attorneys appointed in accordance with the Act of  
17 June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 625), not exceeding \$25 in any one  
18 case.

#### 19 TRAVEL EXPENSES

20 For necessary traveling expenses, not otherwise provided  
21 for, incurred by the Judiciary, including traveling expenses  
22 of probation officers and their clerks, \$715,000: *Provided*,  
23 That this sum shall be available, in an amount not to exceed  
24 \$8,500, for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned



1 with the work of Federal probation when incurred on the  
2 written authorization of the Director of the Administrative  
3 Office of the United States Courts.

4 SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

5 For salaries of court reporters for the district courts of  
6 the United States, as authorized by title 28, United States  
7 Code, section 753, \$988,200.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

9 For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of  
10 the United States Courts, including travel, advertising, rent  
11 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and examination  
12 of estimates for appropriations in the field, \$535,000.

13 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, DISTRICT COURT OF THE  
14 UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

15 For repairs and improvements to the courthouse, includ-  
16 ing repair and maintenance of the mechanical equipment,  
17 and for labor and material and every item incident thereto,  
18 \$7,100, to be expended under the direction of the Architect  
19 of the Capitol.

20 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, UNITED STATES COURT OF  
21 APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

22 For repairs and improvements to the United States  
23 Court of Appeals Building, including repair and maintenance  
24 of the mechanical equipment and for labor and material

1 and every item incident thereto, \$3,700, to be expended  
2 under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

3 SALARIES OF REFEREES

4 For salaries of referees as authorized by the Act of  
5 June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68), \$879,000 to be derived  
6 from the referees' salary fund established in pursuance of  
7 said Act.

8 EXPENSES OF REFEREES

9 For miscellaneous expenses of referees, United States  
10 courts, including the salaries of their clerical assistants,  
11 travel, purchase of envelopes without regard to the Act of  
12 June 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 476), \$1,090,000 to be derived  
13 from the referees' expense fund established in pursuance of  
14 the Act of June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68 (c) (4)).

15 GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

16 SEC. 402. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the  
17 District Court of the United States for the District of  
18 Columbia from all appropriations under this title and 30 per  
19 centum of the expenditures for the United States Court of  
20 Appeals for the District of Columbia from all appropriations  
21 under this title shall be reimbursed to the United States  
22 from any funds in the Treasury to the credit of the District  
23 of Columbia.

24 SEC. 403. The reports of the United States Court of



1 Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not be sold for a  
2 price exceeding that approved by the court and for not more  
3 than \$6.50 per volume.

4 This title may be cited as the "Judiciary Appropriation  
5 Act, 1952".

6 TITLE V—FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES,  
7 INCORPORATED

8 The following corporation is hereby authorized to make  
9 such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing  
10 authority available to such corporation, and in accord with  
11 law, and to make such contracts and commitments without  
12 regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104  
13 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as  
14 may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in  
15 the Budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation,  
16 except as hereinafter provided:

17 Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated: Not to exceed  
18 \$327,000 of the funds of the Corporation shall be available  
19 for its administrative expenses, and not to exceed \$404,-  
20 000 for the expenses of vocational training of prisoners,  
21 both amounts to be computed on an accrual basis and  
22 to be determined in accordance with the Corporation's  
23 prescribed accounting system in effect on July 1, 1946, and  
24 shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, expend-  
25 itures which the said accounting system requires to be capi-

1 talized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or pro-  
2 duced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses  
3 in connection with acquisition, construction, operation,  
4 maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of  
5 facilities and other property belonging to the Corporation or  
6 in which it has an interest.

## 7 TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

8 SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in  
9 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-  
10 poration included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary  
11 or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the  
12 Government of the United States or who is a member of an  
13 organization of Government employees that asserts the right  
14 to strike against the Government of the United States, or who  
15 advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,  
16 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by  
17 force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an  
18 affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the  
19 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions  
20 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of  
21 the United States, is not a member of an organization of  
22 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against  
23 the Government of the United States, or that such person  
24 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization  
25 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the



1 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That  
2 any person who engages in a strike against the Government  
3 of the United States or who is a member of an organization  
4 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike  
5 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-  
6 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,  
7 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by  
8 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or  
9 wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund  
10 contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon  
11 conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned  
12 for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That  
13 the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in  
14 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

15 SEC. 602. None of the funds appropriated in this Act  
16 shall be used to pay an assessment to any international  
17 organization which exceeds one-third of the total annual  
18 cost thereof.

19 SEC. 603. No part of any appropriation or authorization  
20 contained in this Act shall be used to pay compensation  
21 of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position  
22 which may become vacant after August 1, 1951 through  
23 the fiscal year 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall  
24 not apply—

1 (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

2 (b) to positions filled from within the agency;

3 (c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled

4 by appointment of the President by and with the advice and

5 consent of the Senate;

6 (d) to the Department of Justice, except general ad-

7 ministration personnel;

8 (e) to the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

9 (f) to the Judiciary Branch;

10 (g) to the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

11 (h) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2:

12 *Provided further*, That when any department or agency

13 covered in this Act has reduced their employment rolls to

14 80 per centum of the total number on their rolls as of August

15 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply.

16 SEC. 604. This Act may be cited as the "Departments

17 of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropria-

18 tion Act, 1952".

Passed the House of Representatives July 26, 1951.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*



---

## AN ACT

---

Making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

---

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Appropriations







DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND  
THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

AUGUST 21 (legislative day, AUGUST 1), 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted  
the following

## REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 4740]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

|                                                           |                    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Amount of bill as passed House                            | \$1, 045, 940, 115 |
| Amount of decrease by the Senate (net)                    | 23, 057, 852       |
| Amount of bill as reported to Senate                      | 1, 022, 882, 263   |
| Amount of appropriations, 1951                            | 1, 170, 847, 637   |
| Amount of the regular and supplemental estimates,<br>1952 | 1, 258, 296, 141   |

The bill as reported to the Senate:

|                                   |               |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|
| Under the appropriations for 1951 | 147, 965, 374 |
| Under the estimates for 1952      | 235, 413, 878 |



Summary table of 1951 appropriations, 1952 budget estimates, amounts recommended in House bill, and amounts recommended by Senate committee

| Department                             | 1951 appropriations as reduced under section 1214 | 1952 budget estimates | Amount recommended in House bill, 1952 | Amount recommended in Senate bill, 1952 | Increase (+) or decrease (-) Senate bill compared with— |          |                       |          |
|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|
|                                        |                                                   |                       |                                        |                                         | 1951 appropriations                                     |          | 1952 budget estimates |          |
|                                        |                                                   |                       |                                        |                                         | Amount                                                  | Per cent | Amount                | Per cent |
| Appropriations:                        |                                                   |                       |                                        |                                         |                                                         |          |                       |          |
| State.....                             | \$274,469,086                                     | \$253,686,476         | \$226,357,000                          | \$205,877,838                           | -\$68,591,248                                           | -24.99   | -\$77,808,638         | -27.42   |
| Justice.....                           | 158,222,000                                       | 184,353,000           | 181,567,000                            | 181,567,000                             | +23,345,000                                             | +14.75   | -2,789,000            | -1.51    |
| Commerce.....                          | 712,652,886                                       | 763,763,925           | 612,098,000                            | 609,500,560                             | -103,152,326                                            | -14.47   | -154,263,365          | -20.19   |
| Judiciary.....                         | 25,503,665                                        | 26,489,740            | 25,918,115                             | 25,933,865                              | +433,200                                                | +1.69    | -552,875              | -2.08    |
| Total appropriations.....              | 1,170,847,637                                     | 1,258,296,141         | 1,045,940,115                          | 1,022,822,233                           | -147,965,374                                            | -12.63   | -235,413,878          | -18.70   |
| Contract authority:                    |                                                   |                       |                                        |                                         |                                                         |          |                       |          |
| Justice.....                           | 700,000                                           |                       |                                        |                                         | -700,000                                                |          |                       |          |
| Commerce.....                          | 40,865,000                                        |                       |                                        |                                         | -40,865,000                                             |          |                       |          |
| Total contract authority.....          | 41,565,000                                        |                       |                                        |                                         | -41,565,000                                             |          |                       |          |
| Total cash and contract authority..... | 1,212,412,637                                     | 1,258,296,141         | 1,045,940,115                          | 1,022,882,263                           | -189,530,374                                            | -15.63   | -235,413,878          | -20.19   |
|                                        |                                                   |                       |                                        |                                         |                                                         |          | -23,037,852           | -2.20    |

## GENERAL STATEMENT

In considering the appropriations requested by the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, the committee has kept uppermost before it the terrible dangers facing this country at home and abroad. Abroad are the enemies of our system of government and our way of life and at home we face the horrors of inflation which, unless checked, will bring about a downfall just as surely as might come from an enemy. The American people are being called upon to pay a crushing tax burden, and the least that they can expect in return is that every dollar expended by the Government will be expended efficiently and only for those activities that are absolutely necessary.

The committee has examined all of the requests in this bill with great care and is recommending what it believes to be essential appropriations. It will be observed from page 2 of this report that the committee's recommendation is 18.7 percent below the budget estimates. With few exceptions the committee has effected reductions of at least 10 percent in personal services. Provisions have been included in the bill limiting the amounts for personal services generally to 90 percent of the budget estimates in those instances where reductions have been made in the appropriation and generally to 100 percent of the estimates in those instances where reductions have not been effected. As a result of limiting personal service obligations there will be instances where corresponding savings should follow in other objects of expenditure based upon the budget procedure of computing the figures for other objects of expenditure. The departments whose appropriations appear in this bill are instructed to examine each of their appropriation items and in these instances to effect corresponding savings. Likewise the committee in recommending limitations on personal services expects that if the funds are not needed for personal services or in the event it is not possible to fill vacancies thus effecting savings in personal services the resultant savings will remain with the Treasury and not be used for other objects of expenditure.

Section 603 of the bill, which was inserted on the floor of the House and which is referred to as the "Jensen amendment," has been stricken from the bill by the committee.

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The total amount recommended by the committee in the bill for the Department of State is \$205,877,838, which is a reduction of \$77,808,638 from the budget estimates, a reduction of \$20,479,162 below the House bill, and a reduction of \$58,591,248 under the appropriations for the last fiscal year. The largest reductions under the appropriations for the past fiscal year are in the items "International information and educational activities" and "Contributions to international organizations." During the fiscal year 1951, the information program had a total appropriation of \$106,089,789 together with authority to utilize an additional \$15,212,000 in counterpart funds. The committee's recommendation of \$63,000,000 for this program represents a reduction under last year's appropriation of \$58,301,789 including \$15,212,000 in counterpart funds. For contributions to international organizations, the appropriation last year was in the



amount of \$53,549,297 including \$25,000,000 for the International Refugee Organization which item does not appear in the budget for fiscal year 1952. The committee's recommendation of \$30,297,861 represents a reduction under last year of \$23,251,436.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The appropriation entitled "Salaries and Expenses" finances the Department's staff in Washington and the Foreign Service staff all over the world. The budget estimate for fiscal year 1952 is in the amount of \$77,400,000 consisting of \$58,991,476 for personal services and \$18,408,524 for other objects of expenditure such as travel, transportation of things, communication services, etc. The figure of \$58,991,476 for personal services includes \$22,941,838 for the departmental staff in this country, \$29,869,248 for Americans in the Foreign Service, and \$6,180,390 for local employees in the Foreign Service. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$74,487,777 which is a reduction of \$2,912,223 under the budget estimate. In arriving at this figure of \$74,487,777, the committee has effected a 10-percent reduction in the personal services requested for the Department staff in this country and a 10-percent reduction in the personal services requested for the local employees in the Foreign Service. For the Americans in the Foreign Service, the committee recommends no reduction. The committee feels that any reduction in the Foreign Service personnel would seriously affect the ability of the Department to carry out the foreign affairs of the United States, especially in view of the greatly increased responsibilities falling upon the Department as a result of the Korean crisis and related critical international developments.

The amount recommended by the committee represents a reduction of \$1,012,223 under the amount recommended by the House Committee on Appropriations but an increase of \$1,487,777 over the amount recommended by the House. The committee further recommends that a limitation of \$56,079,253 on the amount available for personal services be placed in the bill.

The House recommended language in this appropriation requiring that \$10,000,000 of the appropriation be used for the purchase of foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States, for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation. The committee is in full agreement with this type of language; however, the committee has recommended that the amount be changed to \$7,500,000 inasmuch as it will be necessary for the Department to set up records in this regard and it will be possible to have the plan in operation for only 9 months of the fiscal year in view of the delay on this bill. It is true that the Department has been utilizing foreign currencies under the continuing resolutions; however, there are no detailed records as to whether the foreign currencies are those owed to or owned by the United States Treasury. In approving this language, it is not the intention of the committee that American firms should be placed in an unfavorable competitive position and care should be taken by the Department to avoid this unintended result.

The committee has also recommended that language be inserted in the bill authorizing the use of not to exceed \$200,000 for the maintenance and operation of commissary and mess services. The provision has been in the bill for a number of years for the purpose of pro-

viding for emergencies in which no appropriate marketing or messing facilities exist. Any Federal funds used for this purpose will be reimbursed to the United States Treasury under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act.

#### SALARY ADVANCEMENT FOR DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

The committee has included under the general provisions of the bill a provision authorizing the Secretary of State to place one position in grade GS-17, \$12,200 per annum, in the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949. The purpose of providing for this position is to grant authority to the Secretary to reallocate the position of Director, Office of Budget and Finance, to \$12,200 per annum. The position in question is occupied by Mr. Edward B. Wilber and it is the opinion of the committee that the salary he is receiving is not commensurate with the services he renders to the Government as an outstanding employee of the Department of State.

#### REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCE, FOREIGN SERVICE

The budget estimate for representation allowances is in the amount of \$1,000,000 and the House recommended an appropriation of \$675,000. The appropriation for fiscal 1951 was in the amount of \$675,000. The committee concurs in the amount recommended by the House. Representation allowances are used to establish and maintain relationships with foreign officials. Effective performance of the duties of Foreign Service personnel abroad requires close contact with officials of foreign governments concerned, the presentation to foreign officials of visiting prominent Americans, and the observation and reciprocation of customary courtesies.

#### ACQUISITION OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

For this item the committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,000,000, a reduction of \$2,000,000 below the budget estimate and a reduction of \$1,000,000 below the amount recommended by the House. The committee further recommends that a limitation be placed in the bill restricting the amount which may be used for personal services to \$94,500, which is 10 percent under the budget estimate for personal services of \$105,000. This appropriation is used for the purchase of foreign credits from the United States Treasury due the United States as a result of surplus property and lend-lease settlements. The foreign credits are utilized for the acquisition of property abroad for use as office space as well as residences for the Foreign Service.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

This appropriation finances the United States participation in the United Nations and specialized agencies, the Inter-American organizations and other international organizations. The budget estimate is in the amount of \$30,684,476; however, the Department volunteered before the committee a reduction of \$386,615, thus reducing the amount requested to \$30,297,861. The House Committee on Appropriations recommended an appropriation of \$29,300,000 and the House further reduced the amount to \$27,000,000. The committee



recommends that the full amount of \$30,297,861 requested by the Department be provided. The following table reflects the 1951 adjusted figures and the amounts recommended by the committee for fiscal year 1952:

| By project or functions                                                                       | 1951 adjusted  | 1952 recommended | Difference, increase (+) or decrease (-) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------------------------|
| <b>A. United Nations and specialized agencies:</b>                                            |                |                  |                                          |
| 1. United Nations.....                                                                        | \$13, 576, 243 | \$16, 394, 244   | +\$2, 818, 001                           |
| 2. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.....                      | 2, 814, 381    | 2, 785, 400      | -28, 981                                 |
| 3. International Civil Aviation Organization.....                                             | 1, 103, 319    | 1, 429, 010      | +325, 691                                |
| 4. World Health Organization.....                                                             | 3, 070, 931    | 2, 481, 159      | -589, 772                                |
| 5. Food and Agriculture Organization.....                                                     | 1, 420, 800    | 1, 355, 000      | -65, 800                                 |
| 6. International Labor Organization.....                                                      | 1, 263, 868    | 1, 466, 412      | +196, 544                                |
| 7. International Telecommunication Union.....                                                 | 500, 000       | 375, 000         | -125, 000                                |
| Subtotal.....                                                                                 | 23, 755, 542   | 26, 286, 225     | +2, 530, 683                             |
| <b>B. Inter-American Organizations:</b>                                                       |                |                  |                                          |
| 1. American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood.....                      | 34, 000        | 10, 000          | -24, 000                                 |
| 2. Inter-American Indian Institute.....                                                       | 4, 800         | 4, 800           | -----                                    |
| 3. Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.....                                     | 151, 571       | 153, 480         | +1, 909                                  |
| 4. Pan American Institute of Geography and History.....                                       | 10, 000        | 10, 000          | -----                                    |
| 5. Pan American Railway Congress Association.....                                             | 5, 000         | 5, 000           | -----                                    |
| 6. Pan American Sanitary Bureau.....                                                          | 1, 247, 148    | 1, 355, 329      | +108, 181                                |
| 7. Pan American Union.....                                                                    | 1, 606, 022    | 1, 670, 151      | +64, 129                                 |
| Subtotal.....                                                                                 | 3, 058, 541    | 3, 208, 760      | +150, 219                                |
| <b>C. Other international organizations:</b>                                                  |                |                  |                                          |
| 1. Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of International Arbitration..... | 15, 000        | 15, 000          | -----                                    |
| 2. Cape Spartel and Tangier Light.....                                                        | 2, 955         | 1, 700           | -1, 255                                  |
| 3. Caribbean Commission.....                                                                  | 112, 094       | 127, 058         | +14, 964                                 |
| 4. International Bureau of the Permanent Court of Arbitration.....                            | 1, 600         | 1, 150           | -450                                     |
| 5. International Union for the Protection of Industrial Property.....                         | 2, 060         | 1, 700           | -360                                     |
| 6. International Union for the Publication of Customs Tariffs.....                            | 2, 233         | 2, 233           | -----                                    |
| 7. International Bureau of Weights and Measures.....                                          | 4, 250         | 7, 542           | +3, 292                                  |
| 8. International Council of Scientific Unions and Associated Unions.....                      | 8, 918         | 8, 468           | -450                                     |
| 9. International Hydrographic Bureau.....                                                     | 9, 147         | 9, 147           | -----                                    |
| 10. International Whaling Commission.....                                                     | 420            | 420              | -----                                    |
| 11. International Wheat Council.....                                                          | 22, 781        | 22, 400          | -381                                     |
| 12. Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Commission.....                                              | -----          | 6, 250           | +6, 250                                  |
| 13. South Pacific Commission.....                                                             | 48, 808        | 52, 208          | +3, 400                                  |
| Subtotal.....                                                                                 | 230, 266       | 255, 276         | +25, 010                                 |
| <b>D. Other international activities:</b>                                                     |                |                  |                                          |
| 1. Gorge Memorial Laboratory.....                                                             | 106, 000       | 117, 600         | +11, 600                                 |
| 2. Payment to the Government of Panama.....                                                   | 430, 000       | 430, 000         | -----                                    |
| Subtotal.....                                                                                 | 536, 000       | 547, 600         | +11, 600                                 |
| Total requirements.....                                                                       | 27, 580, 349   | 30, 297, 861     | +2, 717, 512                             |

#### HOUSE LIMITATION TO RESTRICT CONTRIBUTIONS TO ONE-THIRD OF ANNUAL COST

The House adopted an amendment on the floor as follows:

SEC. 602. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to pay any assessment to any international organization which exceeds one-third of the total annual cost thereof.

The committee recommends that this section be stricken from the bill and recommends as a substitute the following section:

SEC. 602. No representative of the United States Government in any international organization hereafter shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the

*budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act: Provided, That in exceptional circumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the budget, a commitment requiring a United States appropriation of a larger proportion may be made after consultation by United States representatives in the organization or other appropriate officials of the Department of State with the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives: Provided, however, That this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the Inter-American organizations.*

#### MISSIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

It is recommended by the committee that the appropriation of \$1,400,000 approved by the House for this purpose be approved. The budget estimate is in the amount of \$1,570,000 and the appropriation for last year was in the amount of \$1,600,000. The committee has included in the bill a limitation on the amount which may be available for personal services of \$1,179,540, which represents a ceiling of 10 percent in the budget estimate for personal services. This appropriation finances the United States mission to the United Nations and the United States missions to other international organizations.

The committee also recommends that the following language be included in the bill:

*Provided further, That employment under this appropriation in connection with the Organization of American States may be without regard to the civil service laws*

The headquarters of the Organization of American States is located in Washington. The United States representative on the council is a Presidential appointee with the personal rank of Ambassador as provided under article 48 of the Charter of the Organization of American States. In order to provide salaries commensurate with the responsibilities and rank of the position as provided in the Organization's charter, the foregoing provision is necessary.

#### INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES

The purpose of this appropriation is to make funds available to the Secretary of State to enable the United States to participate in those international activities and undertakings which arise from time to time in the conduct of foreign affairs for which estimates cannot be developed precisely and individually very far in advance, or which are of a temporary nature and for which specific appropriations have not been provided pursuant to treaties, conventions, or special acts of Congress. The budget estimate is in the amount of \$2,800,000 and the House recommended an appropriation of \$2,600,000. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,500,000 which represents approximately a 10 percent reduction under the budget estimate.

The committee further recommends that the following language be included in this paragraph:

*medical and hospital expenses (not incurred as a result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct) of members of United States delegations while in a travel status outside the United States;*

During the course of a fiscal year approximately 2,000 persons are detailed to or are employed on these activities and serve a total of approximately 150,000 man-days. The conference site or mission



headquarters is sometimes located in an unhealthy or tropical area, and members of the United States delegations must work under hazardous conditions and for long and strenuous hours in order to carry out their assignments.

Not infrequently emergency treatment of accidents or illnesses is required involving medical and sometimes hospital expenses. As a result, the individual officer or employee is subjected to a personal hardship and heavy expenses which would not have been experienced in his local community. Based on past experience, it is estimated that this provision would not result in an expenditure of more than \$2,000 in any year.

#### INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For this purpose, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$900,000, which is the same amount that was made available for the past year and is the amount recommended by the House for the current year. The recommendation is \$300,000 under the budget estimate. The committee also recommends that not to exceed \$737,550 of the amount appropriated shall be available for personal services, which represents a ceiling of 90 percent of the budget estimate for personal services.

##### CONSTRUCTION

For construction, the budget estimate is in the amount of \$16,200,000, the bulk of which is for construction on the Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande River. The House recommended an appropriation of \$14,000,000 and the committee recommends an appropriation of \$12,000,000. Construction on the Falcon Dam was only begun December 13, 1950, and it is the judgment of the committee that the amount recommended will be sufficient to meet all of the payments falling due during the fiscal year. A provision has been placed in the bill limiting the amount which may be used for personal services out of this appropriation to \$1,188,939 which represents a reduction of 10 percent in the budget estimate for this purpose.

##### LANGUAGE PROVISION

For inclusion in the language of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, the committee recommends the following provision:

*expenditures for the purposes set forth in sections 101 through 104 of Public Law 786, approved September 13, 1950;*

For a number of years, many items requiring specification have been carried in the appropriation language for this Commission. Public Law 786 granted authority for these items and they have been deleted from the appropriation language. However, if the foregoing provision were not included in the bill, the Commission would have no authority for nontreaty projects such as the lower Rio Grande flood-control project, the lower Rio Grande bank-protection project, the Rio Grande canalization project and the sanitation projects.

## AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

The budget estimate for this appropriation item is in the amount of \$990,000, including \$338,000 for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission. The House allowed an appropriation of \$702,000, having reduced the amount for the Tuna Commission to \$50,000, a reduction of \$288,000. For the other international commissions, the House allowed the full amount of the budget estimate. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$687,200 including not to exceed \$268,888 for personal services. The 1951 appropriation, the 1952 budget estimate, and the committee recommendation, are as follows:

*American sections, international commissions*

| Projects or functions                                                   | 1951 adjusted | 1952 estimate | Senate committee recommendations 1952 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1. International Joint Commission, United States and Canada             | \$45,800      | \$45,800      | \$45,800                              |
| (a) Special and technical investigations (Public Health Service)        | 55,000        | 62,820        | 55,000                                |
| (b) Special and technical investigations (Geological Survey)            | 110,000       | 130,000       | 110,000                               |
| (c) Special and technical investigations (Corps of Engineers)           | (35,000)      | 111,500       | 70,000                                |
| (d) Special and technical investigations (Federal Power Commission)     | (1,500)       | 8,500         | 3,000                                 |
| 2. International Fisheries Commission, United States and Canada         | 47,000        | 50,000        | 47,000                                |
| 3. International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission                    | 160,000       | 166,350       | 160,000                               |
| 4. International Boundary Commission, United States, Alaska, and Canada | 71,400        | 77,030        | 71,400                                |
| 5. Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission                              |               | 338,000       | 125,000                               |
| Total requirements                                                      | 489,200       | 990,000       | 687,200                               |

## INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

The budget estimate for this Commission is in the amount of \$265,000 and the House allowed an appropriation of \$150,000. The Commission was created by the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, to adjudicate the claims of American nationals against the Federal Peoples Republic of Yugoslavia and the Government of the Republic of Panama. Yugoslavia has deposited \$17,000,000 with the United States, and Panama has signed a settlement agreement to deposit \$400,000, which amounts are to cover payment of the claims of American nationals against these respective governments. It is the belief of the committee that the amount recommended by the House is too low to handle the claims efficiently and expeditiously. Accordingly, the committee recommends that a separate appropriation for this Commission be abolished and that the Commission be financed from "Salaries and expenses, Department of State," the Department to absorb the cost from the \$74,487,777 recommended for salaries and expenses. It is the feeling of the committee that the Secretary will have better control over the financial operations of the Commission if it is financed from this latter appropriation. Also, it is believed that many of the duties of the Commission overseas can be handled by the regular Foreign Service staff, thus obviating the necessity for a separate staff and separate appropriation item. Authorizing language to effect this recommendation has been inserted in the language for salaries and expenses.



## INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For the International Information and Educational Program, the budget estimate for fiscal year 1952 is in the amount of \$115,000,000. The House recommended an appropriation of \$85,000,000 and the committee recommends an appropriation of \$63,000,000, a reduction of \$52,000,000 under the budget estimate and a reduction of \$22,000,000 under the House. The committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate of \$25,164,655 for the Radio Broadcasting Division. For the exchange of persons program, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,000,000 and it is understood that this will enable the Department to initiate exchange programs with countries not now included, such as Iceland, Ireland, and Spain. The following table reflects the operating program for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951, the estimate for 1952, and the amounts recommended by the committee:

*International information and educational activities*

| Activity                                         | 1950 program obligations | 1951 program obligations | 1952 estimate | Senate committee recommendation, 1952 |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| Radio Broadcasting Division.....                 | \$8,855,162              | \$16,174,167             | \$25,164,655  | \$25,164,655                          |
| Press and Publications.....                      | 2,739,273                | 6,806,953                | 11,952,304    | 2,739,273                             |
| Motion Picture Division.....                     | 2,485,409                | 11,803,000               | 13,074,035    | 2,785,409                             |
| Director, International Information.....         | 132,512                  | 159,755                  | 245,960       | 132,512                               |
| Libraries and institutes.....                    | 2,167,884                | 3,689,225                | 7,133,909     | 2,167,884                             |
| Exchange of persons.....                         | 2,562,529                | 6,220,271                | 10,652,960    | 5,000,000                             |
| Director, Educational Exchange.....              | 136,958                  | 152,631                  | 179,704       | 136,958                               |
| Overseas mission activity.....                   | 9,214,435                | 12,562,121               | 27,329,737    | 10,200,000                            |
| Policy advisory staff.....                       | 72,013                   | 142,264                  | 215,598       | 72,013                                |
| Interdepartmental foreign information staff..... | 68,236                   | 120,289                  | 155,016       | 68,236                                |
| Office of General Manager.....                   | 228,282                  | 477,275                  | 707,795       | 228,282                               |
| Public affairs regional bureaus.....             | 409,158                  | 599,736                  | 722,479       | 409,158                               |
| Scientific and technical program.....            | 138,868                  | 160,163                  |               |                                       |
| Administrative support.....                      | 5,799,468                | 11,080,787               | 17,465,848    | 7,000,000                             |
| To be distributed by Department.....             |                          |                          |               | 6,895,620                             |
| Total.....                                       | 35,010,187               | 170,148,637              | 115,000,000   | 63,000,000                            |

<sup>1</sup> Does not include \$50,821,939 for capital outlay.

The committee has inserted language in the bill authorizing the purchase of nine automobiles for use abroad. The committee has also inserted language in the bill authorizing the use of funds for expenses for hospitalization and medical care of grantees who become incapacitated while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation. The committee has also inserted the following language provision in the bill:

*: Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for subscriptions to or distribution of any privately edited or published magazines, journals or newspapers unless copies thereof are regularly filed with the Secretary of the Senate and with the Clerk of the House of Representatives at the time of distribution*

## PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION

The budget estimate of \$3,000,000 was allowed in full by the House. The committee concurs in the action of the House. This appropriation will enable the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, to complete liquidation of previously granted contract authorization.

## MOROCCAN TREATY VIOLATIONS

Moroccan treaty violations have been repeatedly brought to the attention of the committee. They include collection of illegal taxes and customs from Americans, refusal to reimburse previous illegal overcharges and discriminations which deny United States citizens the trade and the equality which is unequivocally guaranteed them by treaty. Previously the committee has recommended to the Senate legislation to assure full compliance by France and Morocco with United States-Morocco treaties. The 1951 General Appropriation Act contained a proviso intended to give France the option of complying with the treaties in question or of giving up ECA aid.

The Department of State has formally agreed with France that both the ECA aid and the treaty violations will continue, thus nullifying the appropriation restriction. The excuse is that France, in a suit filed 3 days before the restriction should have taken effect, seeks to have the International Court of Justice establish that the treaties should not be enforced. The State Department claims that the United States is committed to the mandatory jurisdiction of the Court in this matter.

The committee feels that the claim regarding mandatory jurisdiction is unsubstantiated; that the suit regardless of its outcome will not establish the treaty compliance which alone would justify the ECA payments which were made during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951; that if court action was to be undertaken, this should have been done by the United States when its protests about the treaty violations were ignored and before Congress had given the Department of State an alternative means of forcing treaty compliance. A report of the Subcommittee on Economic Cooperation entitled "Violation of United States Treaty Rights in Morocco" was prepared after investigation in Morocco by a member of the subcommittee's staff. The attitude of the committee is based for the most part on the report and its conclusions.

Apart from the primary consideration as to whether the will of Congress or the will of the Department of State shall determine conditions under which United States appropriations are disbursed, the committee is concerned over the Court action and its possible effect on all United States agreements with foreign nations. According to the Department of State, France seeks to establish "that the United States treaty position in French Morocco is anachronistic, that certain of our treaty rights have ceased to exist or have been superseded by later agreements or practices."

The committee considers that a vigorous defense of this case is essential to the preservation of treaty-making powers as established by the Constitution. The defense should clearly establish that the power of the Court is limited to the interpretation of the treaties as ratified by the Senate, precluding all possibility of a verdict establishing that such treaties may be modified by Executive acts or by acts of any international body. The committee considered a proposal that \$50,000 of State Department funds be earmarked for the defense of this case but considers that special authorization is unnecessary and deems that the foregoing expression of policy should suffice.



## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

For this Department, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$181,567,000, the same amount as was agreed to by the House. The amount recommended is \$2,789,000 under the budget estimates of \$184,356,000, and represents an increase of \$23,345,000 over the appropriations for fiscal year 1951 of \$158,222,000. The largest single increase over the appropriations for 1951 is for the Federal Bureau of Investigation which amounts to \$20,728,000, of the increase. Although the committee has not seen fit to effect 10 percent reductions in the appropriations for the Department of Justice, the committee does recommend that personal service limitations be placed in the bill for the appropriations under the Department. The personal service limitations are in accord with the amounts recommended in the individual appropriations.

## GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

## CRIMINAL DIVISION

The committee concurs in the action of the House in recommending an appropriation of \$9,032,000 for general legal activities which includes among other divisions, the Criminal Division. The funds recommended will enable the Criminal Division to continue to employ the additional employees provided for in supplemental funds granted last year. The committee wishes to take this opportunity to commend very highly the activities of Mr. William Paisley, Chief of the Trial Section of the Criminal Division, and his assistants for their fine work before the Subversive Activities Control Board.

## FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The committee concurs in the action of the House in recommending an appropriation of \$90,000,000 for the FBI. The amount recommended is an increase of \$20,728,000 over the appropriation for last year and is a reduction of \$665,000 in the budget estimate. It is the judgment of the committee that this large increase is necessary in view of the increased workload in the FBI.

The committee has inserted language under the general provisions of the bill increasing the salary of the Associate Director of the FBI from \$14,000 per annum to \$17,500. The committee has also recommended an increase in compensation for the Assistant to the Director from \$11,200 to \$14,000 per annum and for the Assistant Director in charge of Records and Communications to \$14,000 per annum. The language provision also increases the salaries of the remaining seven Assistant Directors of the FBI to \$12,200 per annum. The committee has seen fit to make these recommendations in view of the tremendous amount of work and responsibility which devolves upon these efficient public servants. The FBI is a large organization and the salaries of these men at the present time are not commensurate with the services they perform for the country.

## OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

The budget estimate for this Office is in the amount of \$4,100,000 and the House recommended \$3,600,000. The committee recommends that this authorization be further reduced to \$3,000,000. It is noted that this Office has a total of 187 attorneys. The committee is convinced that this number is entirely too large and has accordingly effected this reduction. The amount of \$3,000,000 is an authorization to use that amount from funds vested in the Attorney General pursuant to the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended.

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

For the Department of Commerce, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$609,500,560, a decrease from the budget estimates of \$154,263,365 and a decrease of \$2,597,440 from the House bill. The amount recommended is \$103,152,326 under the appropriations for last fiscal year.

The largest appropriations under the Department of Commerce provided for in this bill are made to the Bureau of Public Roads and the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Although under the Department of Commerce, the appropriations for the Maritime Administration are not contained in this bill, being carried in the independent offices appropriation bill.

In most of the appropriations under the Department of Commerce, the committee has effected 10-percent reductions under the estimates for personal services. Personal-service limitations have been inserted in the bill in accord with the action taken on the appropriations requested.

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,484,530 which is \$15,470 under the House and represents a reduction of 10 percent from the budget estimate for personal services. Included in the amount recommended is \$85,000 for the Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation and the Office of Transportation. The Department is instructed not to utilize more than the amount of \$85,000 for these offices.

## SALARY ADVANCEMENT FOR DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT

The committee has included under the general provisions of the bill a provision authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to place one position in grade GS-17, \$12,200 per annum, in the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949. The purpose of providing this position is to grant authority to the Secretary to reallocate the position of Director, Office of Budget and Management, to \$12,200 per annum. The position in question is occupied by Mr. Francis R. Cawley and the committee is of the opinion that his salary should be commensurate with the duties he performs and the service he renders to the Government as an outstanding employee of the Department of Commerce.



## CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The House recommended an appropriation of \$99,100,000 for salaries and expenses of the CAA. The committee concurs in the action of the House. The amount recommended is \$3,700,000 under the budget estimate and the Administration is instructed to allocate this reduction in such fashion as to reduce employees engaged in administrative activities rather than employees engaged in connection with the operation of facilities. The CAA is also instructed not to discontinue the operation of facilities as a result of the reduction. The committee has recommended a limitation on personal services which is the equivalent of the budget request for personal services less 10 percent of the amount for nonoperating personnel. This limitation is a ceiling upon personal services and is not to be construed as a mandate for minimum expenditure for this account.

The committee approves the proposed reorganization to accomplish centralized supervision of the work performed by the flight operations, flight maintenance, and aircraft safety divisions. It is the view of the committee that this centralization under a single head in each of the regional offices as well as in Washington should go forward as speedily as possible, and that the change should be accomplished at the same time in Washington and in the field. The committee does not consider it good administrative practice to delay putting the plan into operation in the field while making it effective in Washington. Substantially simultaneous implementation of the reorganization in both the field offices and in Washington will permit the greatest possible advantage to be taken of the opportunities for personnel adjustments which are inherent in the plan. Any regional administrator who continues to resist effectuation of this reorganization in his region should be required to relate his resistance to the specific conditions in his own region which he believes overbalance the benefit to CAA operations as a whole which would result from centralized supervision of the functions, often overlapping, of the flight operations, flight maintenance, and aircraft safety divisions; and in the absence of a clear showing in this regard with respect to any particular region the reorganization should be put into effect promptly in such region as well as in Washington.

## ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

The House recommended an appropriation of \$20,000,000 for this appropriation, a reduction of \$17,150,000 below the budget estimate. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$25,000,000, an increase of \$5,000,000 in the House bill. The appropriation for last fiscal year was in the amount of \$27,500,000 in appropriation and \$13,500,000 in contract authority.

The amount of \$25,000,000 recommended by the committee includes \$12,000,000 for liquidation of contract authority previously granted. The additional \$5,000,000 allowed will provide for important navigation facilities.

## WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

## MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,257,984 which represents a reduction of 10 percent below the budget estimate for personal services. The amount recommended is \$42,016 under the House bill and \$92,016 under the budget estimate of \$1,350,000.

## MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS, TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$350,000, an increase of \$125,000 over the House bill and a reduction of \$100,000 from the budget estimate. The increase recommended will allow the employment of personnel and the purchase of supplies and equipment for the operation of the two new airports at Fairbanks and Anchorage.

## FEDERAL-AID AIRPORT PROGRAM

For the Federal-aid airport program, the House recommended an appropriation of \$35,840,000 consisting of \$17,000,000 for projects in the States, \$1,000,000 for projects in the Territories, \$15,000,000 for liquidation of contract authority previously granted, and \$2,840,000 for administration. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$28,700,000 consisting of \$15,000,000 for projects in the States, \$1,000,000 for projects in the Territories, \$10,000,000 for liquidation of contract authority previously granted, and \$2,700,000 for administration. The amount recommended by the committee is \$7,140,000 under the House bill and \$25,300,000 under the budget estimate. The reduction for administration amounts to a 10-percent reduction under the budget estimate. With respect to the funds for liquidation of contracts, the CAA volunteered to the committee a reduction from \$15,000,000 to \$11,840,000. The committee feels that \$10,000,000 will be sufficient for this purpose during the current year. The committee further recommends that the funds be continued available through fiscal year 1958 to conform with the legislative authority for this program.

## AIR NAVIGATION DEVELOPMENT

For this activity the committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,874,562, a reduction of \$8,438 from the budget estimate and the House bill. The reduction represents a cut of 10 percent in the amount requested for personal services.

## TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT DEVELOPMENT

The committee considered a budget estimate of \$600,000 for transport-aircraft development which was denied in full by the House. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$597,500, the reduction representing a cut of 10 percent in the amount requested for personal services. The appropriation under this head was requested as the first step in carrying out the provisions of Public Law



867, Eighty-first Congress, which authorizes an appropriation of \$12,500,000 over a 5-year period which will be used for the development of engines, airframes, rotors, instruments, accessories, and particularly, turbine-jet and turbine-prop powered aircraft. It is considered essential that funds be provided without delay for this purpose if the United States is to have a chance to regain its position as a leader in the field of transport-aircraft production and if we are to develop to the necessary extent the vast potentialities of jet- and turbine-driven air transports for civil and military purposes.

The committee has been advised that there is no duplication in this activity with the research work now being carried on by other Government agencies.

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,700,000, an increase of \$150,000 over the House bill and a reduction of \$200,000 from the budget estimate. The amount recommended by the committee will allow a modest increase for the CAB in its effort to handle its workload. The committee also recommends authority for the Board to purchase five automobiles for replacement.

#### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

For the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$11,877,688, a reduction of \$497,312 in the House bill and a reduction of \$897,312 from the budget estimate. The amount recommended by the committee reflects a 10-percent reduction from the estimate for personal services.

#### BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

##### FIELD OFFICE SERVICE

The House recommended an appropriation of \$1,900,000. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,953,000, which although an increase of \$53,000 over the House, represents a reduction of 10 percent below the budget estimate for personal services. The budget estimate is in the amount of \$2,130,000 and the appropriation for last year was in the amount of \$2,155,000. The committee directs that the reduction in personnel be applied against those field offices that have the larger staffs.

#### EXPORT CONTROL

For export control, the House recommended an appropriation of \$5,500,000. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,388,180, a reduction of \$111,820 below the House and a reduction of \$511,820 below the budget estimate of \$5,900,000. The amount recommended by the committee represents a reduction of 10 percent in personal services below the amount of the budget estimate.

## BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

## TONGASS FOREST HIGHWAY, ALASKA

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,480,000 for this purpose, a reduction of \$20,000 under the House and the budget estimate. The reduction represents a 10-percent cut in the amount of \$200,000 requested for personal services.

## INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,000,000, a reduction of \$2,000,000 below the House and the budget estimates.

## ACCESS ROADS

For this important activity the committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate of \$3,000,000 which is an increase of \$2,000,000 over the House bill.

## PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS

The committee recommends that there be added to the bill an appropriation of \$2,500,000 for public lands highways. This amount is the balance of public lands highway authorization for the fiscal year 1951 (Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950) not covered by appropriation or contract authority. Public lands highway authorizations have been provided for the improvement of sections of important highways mainly in the Western States lying entirely on the Federal Government domain that have not been improved due to the lack of habitation on such lands and the inability of the States to spread their highway funds far enough to reach such roads. The committee feels that it is important that this appropriation be made available for the improvement of these main roads necessary for the transportation of food, materials and workers in connection with our national defense effort and essential civilian requirements.

## NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

## RESEARCH AND TESTING

For "Research and testing," the committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,807,419, a reduction of \$192,581 in the House bill and a reduction of \$342,581 in the budget estimate. The amount recommended by the committee represents a reduction of 10 percent in the amount requested for personal services.

## RADIO PROPAGATION AND STANDARDS

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,735,220, a reduction of \$64,780 under the House bill and a reduction of \$164,780 from the budget estimate. Again in this instance the committee is recommending a reduction of 10 percent in the amount requested for personal services.



## WORKING CAPITAL FUND

The budget estimate for this purpose is in the amount of \$2,000,000 and the House allowed the full amount of the estimate. The committee recommends that no appropriation be granted at this time for this purpose. There is no reason why agencies for whom the Bureau of Standards performs work cannot reimburse the Bureau of Standards more frequently, thereby obviating the necessity for increasing the present working capital fund of \$3,000,000.

## WEATHER BUREAU

The budget estimate for the Weather Bureau is in the amount of \$27,095,000 and the House recommended an appropriation of \$26,000,000. The appropriation for last year was in the amount of \$24,897,000. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$25,069,477, a decrease of \$930,523 below the House and a reduction of \$2,025,523 below the budget estimate. The recommendation of the committee reflects a 10-percent reduction in the amount requested for personal services.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The committee recommends that the following section be inserted in the bill:

*SEC. 305. Appropriations of the Department of Commerce available for salaries and expenses shall be available in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 for entertainment within or outside the United States of prominent persons, representatives, and dignitaries of foreign governments. The cost of such entertainment, including the reimbursement of officials of the Department of Commerce who have incurred expenses for such entertainment, shall be accounted for solely on the certificate of the Secretary of Commerce.*

Officials of the Department of Commerce are in many instances called upon to entertain visiting dignitaries and at the present time there are no funds appropriated to the Department for this purpose. The amount recommended of \$5,000 will serve for this purpose and must be absorbed from the appropriations granted to the Department.

## THE JUDICIARY

For the judiciary the committee is recommending an appropriation of \$25,936,865 which is an increase of \$18,750 over the House bill and a reduction of \$552,875 from the budget estimates. The additional sum of \$18,750 is necessary to provide funds to equip a library for the court of appeals and the district court for the District of Columbia in the new courthouse for the District. The amount recommended by the committee is \$433,200 in excess of the appropriations for the last fiscal year. Although the committee has not seen fit to effect 10 percent reductions in the appropriations for the judiciary, the committee does recommend that personal services limitations be placed in the bill for the appropriations under the judiciary. The personal service limitations are in accord with the amounts recommended in the individual appropriations.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

## EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN PERSONNEL WORK

The committee recommends that the following provision which has been inserted in several appropriation bills be included in this bill:

*Sec. 603. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: Provided, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.*

\* \* \*

## CHAUFFEURS

The committee recommends that the following amendment with respect to chauffeurs be included in the bill:

*Sec. 604. Except for the automobiles officially assigned to the Secretary of State, the Attorney General and the Secretary of Commerce and automobiles assigned for operation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose primary duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.*

With respect to chauffeurs under the Department of State overseas, the Department is instructed to make a report to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives semi-annually as to the numbers of chauffeurs assigned in the Foreign Service, for what purpose, by whom authorized, how much they are paid and whether they are paid in dollars or in foreign currencies. The committee directs that not to exceed 500 full-time chauffeurs may be employed at any one time in the Foreign Service.

## INFORMATION SPECIALIST

The committee recommends an amendment to limit the number of information specialists. This amendment has been included in several other appropriation bills. In recommending this amendment, the committee has made several changes to cover peculiar situations that exist within the departments covered by this bill.

The committee agrees with the objectives of the amendment, which is to curtail the publicizing of the departments. However, the committee believes that it is not the intent of the amendment to curtail the dissemination of information which is necessary for enforcement of law by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Immigration and Naturalization Service; the promotion of safety of human life by such agencies as the Civil Aeronautics Administration; the dissemination of weather information; or, scientific experimentation by such agencies as the National Bureau of Standards and the Coast and



Geodetic Survey. The committee believes that it is entirely proper for a department to issue scientific and technical bulletins and publications in various fields which are devoted to keeping the public informed of changes in those fields. However, the committee admonishes the departments that its intent is to cut down the flood of publicity releases now being sent out by the departments.

The amendment recommended is as follows:

SEC. 605. No part of the money appropriated by this Act to any department or made available for expenditure by any corporation which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the aggregate budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such department or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) *functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or*

(2) *functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,* shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2). No person whose only performance of the functions described in (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence is in activities necessary for the enforcement of law, promotion of safety of human life, dissemination of weather information, or scientific experimentation, or whose compensation is paid from funds appropriated specifically for International Information and Educational Activities shall be deemed to be engaged in the performance of the functions so described.

#### SUMMARY OF INCREASES

##### Department of State:

|                                                  |                    |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Salaries and expenses-----                       | \$1, 487, 777      |
| Contributions to international organizations---- | 3, 297, 861        |
| Total, Department of State-----                  | <u>4, 785, 638</u> |

##### Department of Commerce:

|                                                                                    |                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Air navigation facilities, establishment of, Civil Aeronautics Administration----- | 5, 000, 000         |
| Maintenance and operation, Alaska airports----                                     | 125, 000            |
| Transport aircraft development-----                                                | 597, 500            |
| Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Board--                                   | 150, 000            |
| Field office service, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce-----                 | 53, 000             |
| Public lands highways-----                                                         | 2, 500, 000         |
| Access roads (act of Sept. 7, 1950)-----                                           | 2, 000, 000         |
| Total, Department of Commerce-----                                                 | <u>10, 425, 500</u> |

##### The Judiciary:

|                                                     |                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Miscellaneous expenses, other courts and services-- | 18, 750             |
| Totals, all titles-----                             | <u>15, 229, 888</u> |

SUMMARY OF DECREASES

|                                                                                             |                     |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Department of State:                                                                        |                     |
| Acquisition of buildings, abroad-----                                                       | \$1, 000, 000       |
| International contingencies-----                                                            | 100, 000            |
| Construction, International Boundary and Water<br>Commission, United States and Mexico----- | 2, 000, 000         |
| American sections, international commissions-----                                           | 14, 800             |
| International Claims Commission-----                                                        | 150, 000            |
| International information and educational activi-<br>ties-----                              | 22, 000, 000        |
| Total, Department of State-----                                                             | <u>25, 264, 800</u> |
| Department of Commerce:                                                                     |                     |
| Salaries and expenses, Office of Secretary-----                                             | 15, 470             |
| Maintenance and operation, Washington Na-<br>tional Airport-----                            | 42, 016             |
| Federal-aid airport program-----                                                            | 7, 140, 000         |
| Air-navigation development-----                                                             | 8, 438              |
| Salaries and expenses, Coast and Geodetic Survey-----                                       | 497, 312            |
| Export Control, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic<br>Commerce-----                             | 111, 820            |
| Tongass Forest Highway, Alaska-----                                                         | 20, 000             |
| Inter-American Highway-----                                                                 | 2, 000, 000         |
| Research and testing, National Bureau of Standards-----                                     | 192, 581            |
| Radio propagation and standards-----                                                        | 64, 780             |
| Working capital fund-----                                                                   | 2, 000, 000         |
| Salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau-----                                                  | 930, 523            |
| Total, Department of Commerce-----                                                          | <u>13, 022, 940</u> |
| Total, all titles-----                                                                      | <u>38, 287, 740</u> |

RECAPITULATION

|                             |                     |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| INCREASES                   |                     |
| Department of State-----    | 4, 785, 638         |
| Department of Commerce----- | 10, 425, 500        |
| The Judiciary-----          | 18, 750             |
| Total increases-----        | <u>15, 229, 888</u> |



## RECAPITULATION—continued

|                                                 | DECREASES |                  |
|-------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Department of State.....                        |           | \$25, 264, 800   |
| Department of Commerce.....                     |           | 13, 022, 940     |
| Total decreases.....                            |           | 38, 287, 740     |
| Total decreases.....                            |           | 38, 287, 740     |
| Total increases.....                            |           | 15, 229, 888     |
| Net decreases.....                              |           | 23, 057, 852     |
| Amount of bill as passed House.....             |           | 1, 045, 940, 115 |
| Net decreases recommended by Senate committee.. |           | 23, 057, 852     |
| Amount of bill as reported to Senate.....       |           | 1, 022, 882, 263 |

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1951 AND THE ESTIMATES FOR 1952 PERMANENT INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS

|                                            | Appropriations,<br>1951 | Estimates, 1952 | Increase (+) or<br>decrease (-) |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| DEPARTMENT OF STATE                        |                         |                 |                                 |
| Replacement of personal property sold..... | \$76,780                | \$79,900        | +\$3,120                        |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE                      |                         |                 |                                 |
| Replacement of personal property sold..... | 220,000                 | 308,000         | +\$88,000                       |
| DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE                     |                         |                 |                                 |
| Replacement of personal property sold..... | 54,125                  | 50,000          | -4,125                          |
| THE JUDICIARY                              |                         |                 |                                 |
| Replacement of personal property sold..... | 1,000                   | 1,000           |                                 |
| Total.....                                 | 351,905                 | 438,900         | +\$86,995                       |



## TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against revenue]

| Object                                                                      | Estimates, 1951 | Estimates, 1952 | Increase (+) or decrease (-) |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------------|
| DEPARTMENT OF STATE                                                         |                 |                 |                              |
| Foreign Service retirement and disability fund.....                         | \$1,355,000     | \$1,450,000     | +\$95,000                    |
| Mexican claims fund.....                                                    | 2,500,000       | 2,500,000       | -----                        |
| Miscellaneous trust funds.....                                              | 132,800         | 42,800          | -----                        |
| Total, Department of State.....                                             | 3,987,800       | 3,992,800       | -----                        |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE                                                       |                 |                 |                              |
| Legal activities and general administration: Miscellaneous trust funds..... | 1,900,000       | 2,000,000       | +\$100,000                   |
| Federal Prison System: Commissary funds.....                                | 1,064,460       | 1,007,000       | -\$57,460                    |
| Total, Department of Justice.....                                           | 2,964,460       | 3,007,000       | +\$42,540                    |
| DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE                                                      |                 |                 |                              |
| Office of the Secretary.....                                                | 129,027         | 64,500          | -----                        |
| Bureau of the Census.....                                                   | 250,000         | 250,000         | -----                        |
| Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.....                                | 14,000          | 15,000          | +\$1,000                     |
| Bureau of Public Roads.....                                                 | 900,000         | 900,000         | -----                        |
| Total, Department of Commerce.....                                          | 1,293,027       | 1,229,500       | -----                        |
| Total, trust funds.....                                                     | 8,245,287       | 8,289,300       | +\$44,013                    |

## CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

| Agency and item                                                 | Approved 1951       |                                  | Estimates,<br>1952 | Recom-<br>mended in<br>House bill<br>for 1952 | Amount<br>recom-<br>mended by<br>Senate<br>committee | Increase (+) or decrease (—) Senate bill<br>compared with—   |                    |            |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|------------|
|                                                                 | Specific<br>amounts | As reduced<br>under sec.<br>1214 |                    |                                               |                                                      | Authoriza-<br>tion as<br>reduced<br>under sec.<br>1214, 1951 | Estimates,<br>1952 | House bill |
| DEPARTMENT OF STATE                                             |                     |                                  |                    |                                               |                                                      |                                                              |                    |            |
| Institute of Inter-American Affairs-----                        | \$1,000,000         |                                  |                    |                                               |                                                      |                                                              |                    |            |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE                                           |                     |                                  |                    |                                               |                                                      |                                                              |                    |            |
| Federal Prison System, buildings and facilities-----            | 700,000             | \$700,000                        |                    |                                               |                                                      | —\$700,000                                                   |                    |            |
| DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE                                          |                     |                                  |                    |                                               |                                                      |                                                              |                    |            |
| Civil Aeronautics Administration:                               |                     |                                  |                    |                                               |                                                      |                                                              |                    |            |
| Air navigation facilities-----                                  | 16,000,000          | 13,500,000                       |                    |                                               |                                                      | —13,500,000                                                  |                    |            |
| Federal-aid airport program-----                                | 36,700,000          | 21,200,000                       |                    |                                               |                                                      | —21,200,000                                                  |                    |            |
| Air navigation development-----                                 | 2,250,000           | 2,250,000                        |                    |                                               |                                                      | —2,250,000                                                   |                    |            |
| National Bureau of Standards, construction of laboratories----- | 3,915,000           | 3,915,000                        |                    |                                               |                                                      | —3,915,000                                                   |                    |            |
| Total, Department of Commerce-----                              | 58,865,000          | 40,865,000                       |                    |                                               |                                                      | —40,865,000                                                  |                    |            |
| Total for all departments-----                                  | 60,565,000          | 41,565,000                       |                    |                                               |                                                      | —41,565,000                                                  |                    |            |

NOTE.—Table does not include contract authority for Bureau of Public Roads which is granted in substantive legislation.





|                                                                        |               |               |             |             |             |             |  |             |             |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--|-------------|-------------|
| International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: |               |               |             |             |             |             |  |             |             |
| Salaries and expenses                                                  | 1,000,000     | 900,000       | 1,200,000   | 900,000     | 900,000     |             |  | -300,000    | -----       |
| Construction                                                           | 3,000,000     | 1,300,000     | 16,200,000  | 14,000,000  | 12,000,000  | +10,700,000 |  | -4,200,000  | -2,000,000  |
| Rio Grande emergency flood protection                                  | 30,000        | 30,000        | 50,000      | 30,000      | 30,000      |             |  | -20,000     | -----       |
| American sections, international commissions                           | 1,508,000     | 1,508,000     | 2,990,000   | 702,000     | 687,200     | +179,200    |  | -302,800    | -14,800     |
| International Claims Commission                                        |               |               | 265,000     | 150,000     |             |             |  | -265,000    | -150,000    |
| International information and educational activities                   | 3,106,089,789 | 3,106,089,789 | 115,000,000 | 85,000,000  | 63,000,000  | -43,089,789 |  | -62,000,000 | -22,000,000 |
| Philippine rehabilitation                                              | 10,000,000    | 10,000,000    | 3,000,000   | 3,000,000   |             |             |  |             | -----       |
| The Institute of Inter-American Affairs                                | 4,500,000     | 5,000,000     | (5)         |             |             |             |  | -5,000,000  | -----       |
| Total, regular annual appropriations, Department of State              | 280,927,086   | 274,469,086   | 283,656,476 | 226,357,000 | 205,877,838 | -68,591,248 |  | -77,808,638 | -20,479,162 |

TITLE II.—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

|                                                               |             |             |             |             |             |            |  |            |       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|--|------------|-------|
| LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION                   |             |             |             |             |             |            |  |            |       |
| General administration, salaries and expenses                 | \$2,175,000 | \$2,175,000 | \$2,363,000 | \$2,250,000 | \$2,250,000 | +75,000    |  | -\$113,000 | ----- |
| General legal activities, salaries and expenses               | 7,905,000   | 7,905,000   | 9,332,000   | 9,032,000   | 9,032,000   | +1,127,000 |  | -300,000   | ----- |
| Antitrust Division, salaries and expenses                     | 3,750,000   | 3,750,000   | 3,700,000   | 3,200,000   | 3,200,000   | -550,000   |  | -500,000   | ----- |
| United States attorneys and marshals, salaries and expenses   | 12,847,000  | 12,747,000  | 13,030,000  | 12,990,000  | 12,990,000  | +243,000   |  | -40,000    | ----- |
| Fees and expenses of witnesses                                | 1,000,000   | 1,000,000   | 1,500,000   | 1,000,000   | 1,000,000   |            |  | -500,000   | ----- |
| Claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, salaries and expenses | 1,300,000   | 690,000     | 750,000     | 725,000     | 725,000     | +35,000    |  | -25,000    | ----- |
| Total, legal activities and general administration            | 28,977,000  | 28,257,000  | 30,675,000  | 29,137,000  | 29,197,000  | +950,000   |  | -1,478,000 | ----- |

1 Plus \$36,500 derived by transfer.  
2 Includes \$120,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 66.  
3 Plus not to exceed \$15,212,000 in counterpart funds.  
4 Plus contract authority of \$1,000,000.  
5 To be submitted as part of technical assistance program in foreign-aid bill.  
6 Includes \$260,000 in H. Doc. No. 139.



*Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1952—Continued*

**TITLE II.—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Continued**

| Agency and item                                             | Appropriations, 1951 |                                  | Estimates,<br>1952 | Recom-<br>mended<br>in House<br>bill for<br>1952 | Amount<br>recom-<br>mended<br>by Senate<br>committee | Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill<br>compared with— |                    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
|                                                             | Specific<br>amount   | As reduced<br>under sec.<br>1214 |                    |                                                  |                                                      | Appropriations, 1951,<br>as reduced<br>under sec.<br>1214   | Estimates,<br>1952 |
| FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION                             |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |
|                                                             | \$69,272,000         | \$69,272,000                     | 7 \$90,665,000     | \$90,000,000                                     | \$90,000,000                                         | +\$20,728,000                                               | —\$665,000         |
|                                                             |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |
| IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE                      |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |
|                                                             | 34,400,000           | 34,340,000                       | 36,700,000         | 36,400,000                                       | 36,400,000                                           | +2,060,000                                                  | —300,000           |
|                                                             |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |
| FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM                                       |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |
|                                                             | 22,179,000           | 22,179,000                       | 23,741,000         | 23,500,000                                       | 23,500,000                                           | +1,321,000                                                  | —241,000           |
|                                                             | 2,180,000            | 2,150,000                        | 475,000            | 470,000                                          | 470,000                                              | —1,680,000                                                  | —5,000             |
| Support of United States prisoners                          | 2,014,000            | 2,014,000                        | 2,100,000          | 2,000,000                                        | 2,000,000                                            | —14,000                                                     | —100,000           |
|                                                             | 26,373,000           | 26,343,000                       | 26,316,000         | 25,970,000                                       | 25,970,000                                           | —373,000                                                    | —346,000           |
|                                                             |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |
| OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY                                    |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |
|                                                             | (4,150,000)          | (4,150,000)                      | (4,100,000)        | (3,600,000)                                      | (3,000,000)                                          | (—1,150,000)                                                | (—1,100,000)       |
|                                                             |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |
| Total, regular annual appropriations, Department of Justice | 159,022,000          | 158,222,000                      | 184,356,000        | 181,567,000                                      | 181,567,000                                          | +23,345,000                                                 | —2,789,000         |
|                                                             |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             | —(600,000)         |

## TITLE III.—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

|                                                                               |                          |                          |             |             |             |              |              |             |  |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--|
| OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY                                                       |                          |                          |             |             |             |              |              |             |  |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                                    | \$1,350,000              | \$1,350,000              | \$1,636,000 | \$1,500,000 | \$1,484,530 | + \$134,530  | — \$151,470  | — \$15,470  |  |
| Technical and scientific services.....                                        | 225,000                  | 225,000                  | 300,000     | 250,000     | 250,000     | + 25,000     | — 50,000     | -----       |  |
| Total, Office of the Secretary.....                                           | 1,575,000                | 1,575,000                | 1,936,000   | 1,750,000   | 1,734,530   | + 159,530    | — 201,470    | — 15,470    |  |
| CENSUS BUREAU                                                                 |                          |                          |             |             |             |              |              |             |  |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                                    | 7,007,000                | 7,007,000                | 7,170,000   | 6,500,000   | 6,500,000   | — 507,000    | — 670,000    | -----       |  |
| Seventeenth Decennial Census.....                                             | 28,500,000               | 28,500,000               | 8,800,000   | 7,000,000   | 7,000,000   | — 21,500,000 | — 1,800,000  | -----       |  |
| Census of Governments.....                                                    | -----                    | -----                    | 2,250,000   | -----       | -----       | -----        | — 2,250,000  | -----       |  |
| Census of business, transportation, manufactures, and mineral industries..... | -----                    | -----                    | 300,000     | 200,000     | 200,000     | + 200,000    | — 100,000    | -----       |  |
| Total, Census Bureau.....                                                     | 35,507,000               | 35,507,000               | 18,520,000  | 13,700,000  | 13,700,000  | — 21,807,000 | — 4,820,000  | -----       |  |
| CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION                                              |                          |                          |             |             |             |              |              |             |  |
| Salaries and expenses.....                                                    | 98,500,000               | 98,500,000               | 102,800,000 | 99,100,000  | 99,100,000  | + 600,000    | — 3,700,000  | -----       |  |
| Air navigation facilities, establishment of.....                              | <sup>10</sup> 27,500,000 | 27,500,000               | 37,150,000  | 20,000,000  | 25,000,000  | — 2,500,000  | — 12,150,000 | + 5,000,000 |  |
| Technical development and evaluation.....                                     | 1,375,000                | 1,375,000                | 1,375,000   | 1,200,000   | 1,200,000   | — 175,000    | — 175,000    | -----       |  |
| Washington National Airport:                                                  |                          |                          |             |             |             |              |              |             |  |
| Maintenance and operation.....                                                | 1,300,000                | 1,300,000                | 1,350,000   | 1,300,000   | 1,257,984   | — 42,016     | — 92,016     | -----       |  |
| Construction.....                                                             | 540,000                  | 540,000                  | 75,000      | 75,000      | 75,000      | -----        | -----        | -----       |  |
| Land acquisition, additional, Washington Airport.....                         | 1,000,000                | 1,000,000                | -----       | -----       | -----       | — 1,000,000  | -----        | -----       |  |
| Federal-aid airport program.....                                              | <sup>12</sup> 37,000,000 | <sup>13</sup> 37,000,000 | 54,000,000  | 35,840,000  | 28,700,000  | — 8,300,000  | — 25,300,000 | — 7,140,000 |  |

<sup>7</sup> Includes \$26,798,000 in H. Doc. No. 66.<sup>8</sup> Includes \$775,000 in H. Doc. No. 94.<sup>9</sup> Plus contract authority of \$700,000.<sup>10</sup> Plus \$16,000,000 in contract authority.<sup>11</sup> Plus \$13,500,000 in contract authority.<sup>12</sup> Plus \$36,700,000 in contract authority.<sup>13</sup> Plus \$21,200,000 in contract authority.



## Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1952—Continued

## TITLE III.—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued

| Agency and item                                     | Appropriations, 1951 |                                  | Estimates,<br>1952 | Recom-<br>mended<br>in House<br>bill for<br>1952 | Amount<br>recom-<br>mended<br>by Senate<br>committee | Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill<br>compared with— |                    |              |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
|                                                     | Specific<br>amount   | As reduced<br>under sec.<br>1214 |                    |                                                  |                                                      | Appropriations, 1951,<br>as reduced<br>under sec.<br>1214   | Estimates,<br>1952 | House bill   |
| CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION—continued          |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |              |
| Alaska airports:                                    |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |              |
| Construction.....                                   | \$3, 200, 000        | \$3, 200, 000                    |                    |                                                  |                                                      | —\$3, 200, 000                                              |                    |              |
| Maintenance and operation.....                      |                      |                                  | \$450, 000         | \$225, 000                                       | \$350, 000                                           | +350, 000                                                   | —\$100, 000        | +\$125, 000  |
| Air-navigation development.....                     | 14 6, 000, 000       | 14 5, 551, 000                   | 15 1, 883, 000     | 1, 883, 000                                      | 1, 874, 562                                          | —3, 676, 438                                                | —8, 438            | —8, 438      |
| Transport-aircraft development.....                 |                      |                                  | 16 600, 000        |                                                  | 597, 500                                             | +597, 500                                                   | —2, 500            | +597, 500    |
| Claims, Federal Airport Act.....                    | 1, 622, 886          | 1, 622, 886                      |                    |                                                  |                                                      | —1, 622, 886                                                |                    |              |
| Total, Civil Aeronautics Administration.....        | 178, 037, 886        | 177, 588, 886                    | 199, 683, 000      | 159, 623, 000                                    | 158, 155, 046                                        | —19, 433, 840                                               | —41, 527, 954      | —1, 467, 954 |
| CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD                             |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |              |
| Salaries and expenses.....                          | 3, 500, 000          | 3, 500, 000                      | 3, 900, 000        | 3, 550, 000                                      | 3, 700, 000                                          | +200, 000                                                   | —200, 000          | +150, 000    |
| COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY                           |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |              |
| Salaries and expenses.....                          | 12, 035, 000         | 12, 035, 000                     | 17 12, 775, 000    | 12, 375, 000                                     | 11, 877, 688                                         | —157, 312                                                   | —897, 312          | —497, 312    |
| BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE             |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |              |
| Departmental salaries and expenses.....             | 5, 150, 000          | 5, 150, 000                      | 3, 339, 000        | 3, 000, 000                                      | 3, 000, 000                                          | —2, 150, 000                                                | —339, 000          |              |
| Field office service.....                           | 2, 155, 000          | 2, 155, 000                      | 2, 130, 000        | 1, 900, 000                                      | 1, 953, 000                                          | —202, 000                                                   | —177, 000          | +53, 000     |
| Export control.....                                 | 2, 925, 000          | 2, 925, 000                      | 18 5, 900, 000     | 5, 500, 000                                      | 5, 388, 180                                          | +2, 463, 180                                                | —511, 820          | —111, 820    |
| Total, Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce..... | 10, 230, 000         | 10, 230, 000                     | 11, 369, 000       | 10, 400, 000                                     | 10, 341, 180                                         | +111, 180                                                   | 1, 027, 820        | —58, 820     |
| PATENT OFFICE                                       |                      |                                  |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                             |                    |              |
| Salaries and expenses.....                          | 11, 500, 000         | 11, 500, 000                     | 11, 600, 000       | 11, 500, 000                                     | 11, 500, 000                                         |                                                             | —100, 000          |              |

| BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS                                            |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |              |              |       |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|-------|-----------|
| Federal aid, highway construction-----                            | 385,000,000       | 385,000,000       | 420,000,000       | 325,000,000       | 325,000,000       | -60,000,000  | -95,000,000  | ----- | -----     |
| Elimination of grade crossings-----                               | 4,600,000         | 4,600,000         | 5,211,925         | 3,000,000         | 3,000,000         | -1,600,000   | -2,211,925   | ----- | -----     |
| Forest highways-----                                              | 22,500,000        | 22,500,000        | 25,000,000        | 21,000,000        | 21,000,000        | -1,500,000   | -4,000,000   | ----- | -----     |
| Tongass Forest Highway, Alaska-----                               | 3,500,000         | 3,500,000         | 3,500,000         | 3,500,000         | 3,480,000         | -20,000      | -20,000      | ----- | -----     |
| Access roads-----                                                 | ( <sup>19</sup> ) | ( <sup>19</sup> ) | ( <sup>19</sup> ) | ( <sup>19</sup> ) | ( <sup>19</sup> ) | -----        | -----        | ----- | -----     |
| War and emergency damages, Territory of Hawaii-----               | 4,000,000         | 4,000,000         | 2,000,000         | 2,000,000         | 2,000,000         | +2,000,000   | -----        | ----- | -----     |
| Inter-American Highway-----                                       | 750,000           | 750,000           | 4,000,000         | 4,000,000         | 2,000,000         | -2,000,000   | -2,000,000   | ----- | -----     |
| Public Lands highways-----                                        | 20 5,000,000      | 20 5,000,000      | -----             | -----             | 2,500,000         | +1,750,000   | +2,500,000   | ----- | -----     |
| Access roads (act of Sept. 7, 1950)-----                          | 425,350,000       | 425,350,000       | 21 3,000,000      | 1,000,000         | 3,000,000         | -2,000,000   | -----        | ----- | -----     |
| Total, Bureau of Roads-----                                       | 425,350,000       | 425,350,000       | 462,711,925       | 359,500,000       | 361,980,000       | -63,370,000  | -100,731,925 | ----- | -----     |
| NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS                                      |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |              |              |       |           |
| Operation and administration-----                                 | 1,270,000         | 1,270,000         | 1,208,000         | 1,100,000         | 1,100,000         | -170,000     | -109,000     | ----- | -----     |
| Research and testing-----                                         | 4,300,000         | 4,300,000         | 4,150,000         | 4,000,000         | 3,807,419         | -492,581     | -342,581     | ----- | -192,581  |
| Radio propagation and standards-----                              | 3,000,000         | 3,000,000         | 2,900,000         | 2,800,000         | 2,735,220         | -264,780     | -164,780     | ----- | -64,780   |
| Construction of laboratories-----                                 | 22 1,900,000      | 22 1,900,000      | 3,915,000         | 3,800,000         | 3,800,000         | +1,900,000   | -115,000     | ----- | -----     |
| Working capital fund-----                                         | -----             | -----             | 23 2,000,000      | 2,000,000         | -----             | -----        | -2,000,000   | ----- | -----     |
| Total, National Bureau of Standards-----                          | 10,470,000        | 10,470,000        | 14,174,000        | 13,700,000        | 11,442,639        | +972,639     | -2,731,361   | ----- | -2,257,3  |
| WEATHER BUREAU                                                    |                   |                   |                   |                   |                   |              |              |       |           |
| Salaries and expenses-----                                        | 24,897,000        | 24,897,000        | 24 27,095,000     | 26,000,000        | 25,069,477        | +172,477     | -2,025,523   | ----- | -20,5     |
| Total, regular annual appropriations, Department of Commerce----- | 713,101,886       | 712,652,886       | 763,763,925       | 612,098,000       | 609,500,560       | -103,152,366 | -154,263,365 | ----- | -2,57,440 |

<sup>14</sup> Plus \$2,250,000 in contract authority.

<sup>15</sup> Includes decrease of \$6,117,000 as contained in H. Doc. No. 100.

<sup>16</sup> Contained in H. Doc. No. 178.

<sup>17</sup> Includes \$325,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 100.

<sup>18</sup> Contained in H. Doc. No. 139.

<sup>19</sup> Not to exceed \$70,000 of unexpended balance made available.

<sup>20</sup> Plus \$2,000,000 derived by transfer.

<sup>21</sup> Contained in H. Doc. No. 139.

<sup>22</sup> Plus contract authority of \$3,915,000.

<sup>23</sup> Contained in H. Doc. No. 139.

<sup>24</sup> Includes \$475,000 contained in H. Doc. No. 100.



## Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1952—Continued

## TITLE IV.—THE JUDICIARY

| Agency and item                                 | Appropriations, 1951 |                                                | Estimates,<br>1952 | Recom-<br>mended<br>in House<br>bill for<br>1952 | Amount<br>recom-<br>mended<br>by Senate<br>committee | Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill<br>compared with—  |                    |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
|                                                 | Specific<br>amount   | As reduced<br>under sec.<br>1214 <sup>23</sup> |                    |                                                  |                                                      | Appropriations,<br>1951,<br>as reduced<br>under sec.<br>1214 | Estimates,<br>1952 |
| SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES              |                      |                                                |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                              |                    |
| Salaries.....                                   | \$915,000            | \$915,000                                      | \$928,000          | \$928,000                                        | \$928,000                                            | +\$13,000                                                    | -----              |
| Printing and binding Supreme Court reports..... | 91,200               | 91,200                                         | 91,200             | 91,200                                           | 91,200                                               | -----                                                        | -----              |
| Miscellaneous expenses.....                     | 52,100               | 52,100                                         | 58,350             | 58,350                                           | 58,350                                               | +6,250                                                       | -----              |
| Car of building and grounds.....                | 159,200              | 159,200                                        | 160,700            | 160,700                                          | 160,700                                              | +1,500                                                       | -----              |
| Total, Supreme Court.....                       | 1,217,500            | 1,217,500                                      | 1,238,250          | 1,238,250                                        | 1,238,250                                            | +20,750                                                      | -----              |
| COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS             |                      |                                                |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                              |                    |
| Salaries and expenses.....                      | 192,200              | 192,200                                        | 194,500            | 194,500                                          | 194,500                                              | +2,300                                                       | -----              |
| CUSTOMS COURT                                   |                      |                                                |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                              |                    |
| Salaries and expenses.....                      | 417,465              | 417,465                                        | 438,465            | 433,165                                          | 433,165                                              | +15,700                                                      | -\$5,300           |
| COURT OF CLAIMS                                 |                      |                                                |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                              |                    |
| Salaries and expenses.....                      | 575,000              | 575,000                                        | 590,000            | 579,800                                          | 579,800                                              | +4,800                                                       | -10,200            |
| Repairs and improvements.....                   | 10,700               | 10,700                                         | 159,100            | 9,100                                            | 9,100                                                | -1,600                                                       | -150,000           |
| Total, Court of Claims.....                     | 585,700              | 585,700                                        | 749,100            | 588,900                                          | 588,900                                              | +3,200                                                       | -160,200           |
| OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES                       |                      |                                                |                    |                                                  |                                                      |                                                              |                    |
| Hawaii.....                                     | 106,500              | 106,500                                        | 26 124,500         | 120,000                                          | 120,000                                              | +13,500                                                      | -4,500             |
| Salaries of judges.....                         | 5,095,000            | 5,095,000                                      | 5,138,125          | 5,120,000                                        | 5,120,000                                            | +25,000                                                      | -18,125            |
| Salaries of clerks.....                         | 4,470,000            | 4,470,000                                      | 4,614,000          | 4,520,000                                        | 4,520,000                                            | +50,000                                                      | -94,000            |

|                                                                                                                      |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                |                |               |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Probation system.....                                                                                                | 2, 145, 000      | 2, 145, 000      | 2, 198, 700      | 2, 180, 000      | 2, 180, 000      | +35, 000       | -18, 700       | -----         |
| Salaries of clerks.....                                                                                              | 520, 000         | 520, 000         | 542, 300         | 542, 300         | 542, 300         | +22, 300       | -----          | -----         |
| Fees of commissioners.....                                                                                           | 475, 000         | 475, 000         | 543, 000         | 543, 000         | 543, 000         | +68, 000       | -----          | -----         |
| Fees of jurors.....                                                                                                  | 2, 900, 000      | 2, 900, 000      | 2, 900, 000      | 2, 800, 000      | 2, 800, 000      | -100, 000      | -----          | -----         |
| Miscellaneous salaries.....                                                                                          | 2, 600, 000      | 2, 600, 000      | 2, 682, 700      | 2, 670, 000      | 2, 670, 000      | +70, 000       | -----          | -----         |
| Miscellaneous expenses.....                                                                                          | 675, 000         | 675, 000         | 795, 800         | 750, 000         | 763, 750         | +83, 750       | -27, 050       | +18, 750      |
| Travel expenses.....                                                                                                 | 725, 000         | 725, 000         | 725, 000         | 715, 000         | 715, 000         | -10, 000       | -----          | -----         |
| Salaries of court reporters.....                                                                                     | 972, 000         | 972, 000         | 988, 200         | 988, 200         | 988, 200         | +16, 200       | -----          | -----         |
| Administrative Office, salaries and expenses.....                                                                    | 520, 000         | 520, 000         | 537, 900         | 535, 000         | 535, 000         | +15, 000       | -2, 900        | -----         |
| Repairs and improvements, District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.....                      | 7, 100           | 7, 100           | 15, 600          | 7, 100           | 7, 100           | -----          | -8, 500        | -----         |
| Repairs and improvements, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.....                           | 6, 200           | 6, 200           | 3, 700           | 3, 700           | 3, 700           | -2, 500        | -----          | -----         |
| Referees, special account:                                                                                           |                  |                  |                  |                  |                  |                |                |               |
| Salaries.....                                                                                                        | 879, 000         | 879, 000         | 879, 000         | 879, 000         | 879, 000         | -----          | -----          | -----         |
| Expenses.....                                                                                                        | 995, 000         | 995, 000         | 1, 180, 900      | 1, 090, 000      | 1, 090, 000      | +95, 000       | -90, 900       | -----         |
| Total, other courts and services.....                                                                                | 23, 090, 800     | 23, 090, 800     | 23, 869, 425     | 23, 463, 300     | 23, 482, 050     | +391, 250      | -387, 375      | +18, 750      |
| Total, title IV, the Judiciary.....                                                                                  | 25, 503, 665     | 25, 503, 665     | 26, 489, 740     | 25, 918, 115     | 25, 935, 865     | +433, 200      | -552, 875      | +18, 750      |
| Grand total appropriations titles I, II, III, and IV Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary..... | 1, 178, 554, 637 | 1, 170, 847, 637 | 1, 258, 296, 141 | 1, 045, 940, 115 | 1, 022, 882, 263 | -147, 965, 374 | -235, 413, 878 | -23, 057, 852 |

<sup>23</sup> See 1214 not applicable to the Judiciary.

<sup>24</sup> Includes \$7,500 contained in House Doc. No. 162.





Calendar No. 659

82D CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 4740

[Report No. 697]

---

## IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AUGUST 21 (legislative day, AUGUST 1), 1951

Reported by Mr. McCARRAN, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1      *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2      *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3      That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4      in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-  
5      ments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for  
6      the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely:



## TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Department of State not otherwise provided for, including expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801–1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r); *settlement of claims as authorized by Public Law 455, approved March 10, 1950*; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of aircraft outside the continental United States; printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of uniforms; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by contract, for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; establishment, maintenance,

1 and operation of passport and despatch agencies; examina-  
2 tion of estimates of appropriations in the field; ice and  
3 drinking water for use abroad; excise taxes on negotiable  
4 instruments abroad; loss by exchange; radio communica-  
5 tions; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial  
6 information, telephone and similar services abroad; relief,  
7 protection, and burial of American seamen, and alien seamen  
8 in foreign countries and in the United States Territories and  
9 possessions; expenses incurred in acknowledging services of  
10 officers and crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing  
11 American seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or  
12 other catastrophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining  
13 in Egypt, Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American  
14 convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court,  
15 and care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared  
16 insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192),  
17 of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons  
18 charged with crime; and procurement by contract or other-  
19 wise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1)  
20 translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical infor-  
21 mation, (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geo-  
22 graphic aids, (4) maintenance, improvement, and repair  
23 of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries,  
24 including minor construction on Government-owned proper-  
25 ties, (5) fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased



1 property abroad, ~~and~~ (6) rental or lease, for periods not  
 2 exceeding ten years, of offices, buildings, grounds, and living  
 3 quarters for the use of the Foreign Service, for which pay-  
 4 ments made be made in advance *and* (7) *not to exceed*  
 5 *\$200,000 for maintenance and operation of commissary and*  
 6 *mess services; ~~\$73,000,000~~ \$74,487,777, of which not to*  
 7 *exceed \$56,079,253 shall be available for personal services:*  
 8 *Provided, That not less than ~~\$10,000,000~~ \$7,500,000 of*  
 9 *this appropriation shall be used to purchase foreign currencies*  
 10 *or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United*  
 11 *States for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation:*  
 12 *Provided further, That pursuant to section 201 (c) of the*  
 13 *Act of June 30, 1949 (41 U. S. C. 231c), passenger motor*  
 14 *vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be*  
 15 *exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds*  
 16 *of such sales shall be available without fiscal year limitation*  
 17 *for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the*  
 18 *cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replace-*  
 19 *ment shall not exceed \$3,000 in the case of the chief of*  
 20 *mission automobile at each diplomatic mission and \$1,400 in*  
 21 *the case of all other such vehicles except station wagons.*

#### 22 REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

23 For representation allowances as authorized by sec-  
 24 tion 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.  
 25 S. C. 1131), \$675,000.

## ACQUISITION OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

For carrying into effect the Act of July 25, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 295b), including the initial alterations, repair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said Act, ~~\$8,000,000~~ \$7,000,000, of which not to exceed \$94,500 shall be available for personal services, and which is exclusively for expenditure under the provisions of said Act which relate to payments representing the value of foreign property or credits: *Provided*, That, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of State or such Assistant Secretary as he may designate, section 6 of the Act of May 7, 1926, may be construed as including leaseholds of not less than ten years.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR  
SERVICE

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, to be expended pursuant to the requirement of section 291 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 107), \$9,900,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State may delegate to subordinate officials the authority vested in him by section 291 of the Revised Statutes pertaining to certification of expenditures.

## CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to meet annual obligations to international organizations, the Government of Panama, and



1 Gorgas Memorial Institute, pursuant to treaties, conventions,  
2 or specific Acts of Congress, ~~\$27,000,000~~ \$30,297,861, to-  
3 gether with such additional sums due to increase in rates of  
4 exchange as the Secretary of State may determine and certify  
5 to the Secretary of the Treasury to be necessary to pay, in  
6 foreign currencies, the quotas and contributions required by  
7 the several treaties, conventions, or laws established by  
8 the amount of the obligation: Provided, That the  
9 Department of State, when requested by the United  
10 Nations, is authorized to acquire surplus property for the  
11 United Nations in accordance with existing surplus property  
12 disposal laws and regulations, and the contribution of the  
13 United States to the United Nations shall be reduced by  
14 the value of the surplus property and necessary expenses,  
15 including transportation costs, incidental to the acquisition  
16 thereof.

17       MISSIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

18       For expenses necessary for permanent representation to  
19 certain international organizations in which the United States  
20 participates pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific  
21 Acts of Congress, including expenses authorized by the  
22 pertinent Acts and Conventions providing for such repre-  
23 sentation; attendance at meetings of societies or associations  
24 concerned with the work of the organizations; salaries, ex-  
25 penses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as

1 authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended  
2 (22 U. S. C. 801-1158) ; purchase (not to exceed one,  
3 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;  
4 printing and binding, without regard to section 11 of the  
5 Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111) ; and purchase  
6 of uniforms for guards and chauffeurs, \$1,400,000, *of which*  
7 *not to exceed \$1,179,540 shall be available for personal serv-*  
8 *ices: Provided, That the provisions of section 8 of the United*  
9 *Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, and regula-*  
10 *tions thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant*  
11 *to that Act, may be applicable to the obligation and expendi-*  
12 *ture of funds in connection with United States participation*  
13 *in the International Civil Aviation Organization: Provided*  
14 *further, That employment under this appropriation in con-*  
15 *nection with the Organization of American States may be*  
16 *without regard to the civil service laws.*

#### 17 INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES

18 For necessary expenses of participation by the United  
19 States upon approval by the Secretary of State, in inter-  
20 national activities which arise from time to time in the  
21 conduct of foreign affairs and for which specific appropria-  
22 tions have not been provided pursuant to treaties, conven-  
23 tions, or special Acts of Congress, including personal services  
24 without regard to civil-service and classification laws; salaries,  
25 expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as



1 authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended  
2 (22 U. S. C. 801-1158) ; employment of aliens; travel ex-  
3 penses without regard to the Standardized Government  
4 Travel Regulations and without regard to the rates of per  
5 diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the  
6 Travel Expense Act of 1949; not to exceed \$15 per diem  
7 in lieu of subsistence for persons serving without compen-  
8 sation in an advisory capacity while away from their homes  
9 or regular places of business; *medical and hospital expenses*  
10 *(not incurred as a result of vicious habits, intemperance, or*  
11 *misconduct) of members of United States delegations while in*  
12 *a travel status outside the United States*; rent of quarters by  
13 contract or otherwise; hire of passenger motor vehicles; con-  
14 tributions for the share of the United States in expenses of  
15 international organizations; and printing and binding without  
16 regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44  
17 U. S. C. 111) ; ~~\$2,600,000~~ \$2,500,000, of which not to  
18 exceed a total of \$100,000 may be expended for representa-  
19 tion allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Act of  
20 August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131) and for entertainment.

21 INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,

22 UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

23 For expenses necessary to enable the United States to  
24 meet its obligations under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905,  
25 1906, 1933, and 1944 between the United States and

1 Mexico, and to comply with the other laws applicable to  
2 the United States Section, International Boundary and  
3 Water Commission, United States and Mexico, including  
4 operation and maintenance of the Rio Grande rectification,  
5 canalization, flood control, bank protection, boundary fence,  
6 and sanitation projects; detailed plan preparation and con-  
7 struction (including surveys and operation and maintenance  
8 and protection during construction) ; Rio Grande emergency  
9 flood protection; *expenditures for the purposes set forth in*  
10 *sections 101 through 104 of Public Law 786, approved Sep-*  
11 *tember 13, 1950*; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles  
12 for replacement only; purchase of planographs and litho-  
13 graphs; and leasing of private property to remove therefrom  
14 sand, gravel, stone, and other materials, without regard to  
15 section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41  
16 U. S. C. 5) ; as follows:

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For salaries and expenses, regular boundary activities,  
19 including examinations, preliminary surveys, and investi-  
20 gations, \$900,000, *of which not to exceed \$737,550 shall be*  
21 *available for personal services.*

22 CONSTRUCTION

23 For detailed plan preparation and construction of projects  
24 authorized by the Convention concluded February 1, 1933,  
25 between the United States and Mexico, the Acts approved



1 August 19, 1935, as amended (22 U. S. C. 277-277f),  
2 August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 961), June 4, 1936 (49 Stat.  
3 1463), June 28, 1941 (22 U. S. C. 277f), September 13,  
4 1950 (Public Law 786), and the projects stipulated in  
5 the treaty between the United States and Mexico signed at  
6 Washington on February 3, 1944, ~~\$14,000,000~~ \$12,000,000,  
7 *of which not to exceed \$1,188, 939 shall be available for per-*  
8 *sonal services, to remain available until expended: Provided,*  
9 *That no expenditures shall be made for the lower Rio Grande*  
10 *flood-control project for construction on any land, site, or ease-*  
11 *ment in connection with this project except such as has been*  
12 *acquired by donation and the title thereto has been approved*  
13 *by the Attorney General of the United States: Provided*  
14 *further, That expenditures for the Rio Grande bank-protection*  
15 *project shall be subject to the provisions and conditions con-*  
16 *tained in the appropriation for said project as provided*  
17 *by the Act approved April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 89): Pro-*  
18 *vided further, That unexpended balances of appropriations*  
19 *for construction under the International Boundary and*  
20 *Water Commission available for the next preceding fiscal*  
21 *year shall be merged with this appropriation and shall*  
22 *continue available until expended.*

23       RIO GRANDE EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION

24       For emergency flood-control work, including protection,  
25 reconstruction, and repair of all structures under the juris-

1 diction of the International Boundary and Water Com-  
2 mission, United States and Mexico, threatened or damaged  
3 by floodwaters of the Rio Grande, which have heretofore  
4 been authorized and erected under the provisions of treaties  
5 between the United States and Mexico, or in pursuance of  
6 Federal laws authorizing improvements on the Rio Grande,  
7 \$30,000, to be merged with the unobligated balance of the  
8 appropriation for this purpose for the next preceding fiscal  
9 year, and to remain available until expended.

10 AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

11 For expenses necessary to enable the President to per-  
12 form the obligations of the United States pursuant to con-  
13 ventions between the United States and Canada signed  
14 May 26, 1930 (50 Stat. 1355) and January 29, 1937  
15 (50 Stat. 1351), treaties between the United States and  
16 Great Britain, in respect to Canada, signed January 11,  
17 1909 (36 Stat. 2448) and February 24, 1925 (44 Stat.  
18 2102), the treaty between the United States and Canada  
19 signed February 27, 1950, and Convention between the  
20 United States and Costa Rica signed May 31, 1949, including  
21 stenographic reporting services by contract; hire of passenger  
22 motor vehicles; the United States share of the expenses of  
23 the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, the  
24 International Fisheries Commission, and the Inter-American  
25 Tropical Tuna Commission, which except for the expenses



1 of the members, may be advanced to the respective Com-  
2 missions; ~~\$702,000~~ \$687,200, of which not to exceed \$268,-  
3 888 shall be available for personal services, to be disbursed  
4 under the direction of the Secretary of State and to be avail-  
5 able also for additional expenses of the American Sections,  
6 International Commissions, as hereinafter set forth:

7       International Joint Commission, United States and  
8 Canada, the salary of one Commissioner on the part of the  
9 United States who shall serve at the pleasure of the Presi-  
10 dent (the other Commissioners to serve in that capacity  
11 without compensation therefor); salaries of clerks and other  
12 employees appointed by the Commissioners on the part of  
13 the United States with the approval solely of the Secretary  
14 of State; travel expenses and compensation of witnesses in  
15 attending hearings of the Commission at such places in the  
16 United States and Canada as the Commission or the Ameri-  
17 can Commissioners shall determine to be necessary; and  
18 special and technical investigations in connection with mat-  
19 ters falling within the Commission's jurisdiction: *Provided,*  
20 That the Secretary of State is authorized to transfer to any  
21 department or independent establishment of the Government,  
22 with the consent of the head thereof, funds from this appro-  
23 priation for direct expenditure by such department or estab-  
24 lishment for such investigations.

25       International Boundary Commission, United States,

1 Alaska, and Canada, the completion of such remaining work  
2 as may be required under the award of the Alaskan Bound-  
3 ary Tribunal and the existing treaties between the United  
4 States and Great Britain; commutation of subsistence to em-  
5 ployees while on field duty, not to exceed \$6 per day each  
6 (but not to exceed \$3 per day each when a member of a  
7 field party and subsisting in camp) ; hire of freight and pas-  
8 senger motor vehicles from temporary field employees; and  
9 payment for timber necessarily cut in keeping the boundary  
10 line clear.

#### 11 INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

12 For expenses necessary to enable the Commission to  
13 settle certain claims of the Government of the United States  
14 on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals  
15 against foreign governments as authorized by Public Law  
16 455, approved March 10, 1950, including expenses of attend-  
17 ance at meetings of organizations concerned with the pur-  
18 pose of this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles  
19 for field use only; services as authorized by section 15 of  
20 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and employ-  
21 ment of aliens; \$150,000.

#### 22 INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL 23 ACTIVITIES

24 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of  
25 State to carry out international information and educational



1 activities as authorized by the United States Information  
2 and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U. S. C. 1431-  
3 1479) and the Act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 501),  
4 and to administer the programs authorized by section 32 (b)  
5 (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50  
6 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b) ), the Act of August 24, 1949 (20  
7 U. S. C. 222-224), and the Act of September 29, 1950  
8 (Public Law 861), including employment, without regard  
9 to the civil-service and classification laws, of (1) persons on  
10 a temporary basis (not to exceed \$120,000), (2) aliens  
11 within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service  
12 in the United States relating to the translation or narration  
13 of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be  
14 investigated for such employment in accordance with pro-  
15 cedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney  
16 General) ; travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for  
17 service in the United States and dependents to and from the  
18 United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of per-  
19 sonnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service  
20 Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158) ; expenses  
21 of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided  
22 for under this appropriation (not to exceed \$8,000) ; enter-  
23 tainment within the United States (not to exceed \$5,000) ;  
24 *purchase (not to exceed nine) for use abroad and hire of*  
25 *passenger motor vehicles; purchase of space in foreign*

1 language publications abroad, without regard to the pro-  
2 visions of law set forth in 44 U. S. C. 322; services as au-  
3 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
4 U. S. C. 55a); advance of funds notwithstanding section  
5 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; *expenses for*  
6 *hospitalization and medical care of grantees who become*  
7 *incapacitated while participating in activities authorized*  
8 *under this appropriation*; actual expenses of preparing and  
9 transporting to their former homes the remains of persons,  
10 not United States Government employees, who may die  
11 away from their homes while participating in activities  
12 authorized under this appropriation; establishment and  
13 operation of agricultural and other experiment and  
14 demonstration stations in other American countries,  
15 on land acquired by gift or lease, and construction of neces-  
16 sary buildings thereon; radio activities and acquisition and  
17 production of motion pictures and visual materials and pur-  
18 chase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor,  
19 narration, script-writing, translation, and engineering serv-  
20 ices, by contract or otherwise; and purchase of objects for  
21 presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organiza-  
22 tions ~~\$85,000,000~~ \$63,000,000, *of which not to exceed*  
23 *\$25,830,000 shall be available for personal services:*  
24 *Provided, That not to exceed \$50,000 may be used*



1 for representation abroad: *Provided further*, That, not-  
2 withstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Re-  
3 vised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the De-  
4 partment of State is authorized in making contracts for the  
5 use of the international short-wave radio stations and facili-  
6 ties, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the  
7 owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from  
8 such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose  
9 against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or  
10 property arising from such use of said radio stations and  
11 facilities: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of lease-  
12 hold interests payments may be made in advance for the  
13 entire term or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That funds  
14 herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than  
15 75 per centum of the effective daily broadcasting time from  
16 any person or corporation holding an international short-wave  
17 broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Com-  
18 mission without the consent of such licensee: *Provided fur-*  
19 *ther*, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for  
20 payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of  
21 contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of  
22 motion-picture films: *Provided further*, That no part of this  
23 appropriation shall be expended for subscriptions to or dis-  
24 tribution of any privately edited or published magazines,

1 *journals or newspapers unless copies thereof are regularly*  
2 *filed with the Secretary of the Senate and with the Clerk of*  
3 *the House of Representatives at the time of distribution.*

#### 4 PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION

5 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
6 thority granted under this head in the Department of  
7 State Appropriation Act, 1949, \$3,000,000, to be con-  
8 solidated with appropriations heretofore made under said  
9 head; and the unobligated balance of such consolidated  
10 appropriation shall remain available during the current fiscal  
11 year upon the terms and conditions specified under this  
12 head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1950,  
13 for expenses of liquidation of activities in the Philippines  
14 carried out pursuant to section 302 (a) of the Philippine  
15 Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.  
16 1782, 1791 (e)), and for carrying out the purposes of  
17 section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946,  
18 as authorized by section 3 of the Act of July 2, 1948 (Public  
19 Law 882).

#### 20 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

21 SEC. 102. Contracts entered into in foreign countries  
22 involving expenditures from any of the appropriations under  
23 this title shall not be subject to the provisions of section  
24 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22).



1        SEC. 103. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6  
2 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the pro-  
3 visions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his  
4 absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate  
5 the employment of any officer or employee of the Department  
6 of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States  
7 whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or  
8 advisable in the interests of the United States.

9        SEC. 104. The exchange of funds for payment of ex-  
10 penses in connection with the operation of diplomatic and  
11 consular establishments abroad shall not be subject to the  
12 provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31  
13 U. S. C. 543).

14        SEC. 105. Appropriations under this title available for  
15 expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the  
16 continental United States, including travel of dependents and  
17 transportation of personal effects, household goods, or auto-  
18 mobiles of such personnel, shall be available for such ex-  
19 penses when any part of such travel or transportation begins  
20 in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in  
21 that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or  
22 transportation may not be completed during the current fiscal  
23 year.

24        SEC. 106. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 16a  
25 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78 (a)), Govern-

1   ment-owned vehicles may be used in foreign countries for  
2   transportation of United States Government employees from  
3   their residence to the office and return when public trans-  
4   portation facilities are unsafe or are not available: *Provided*,  
5   That each Chief of Mission shall have prior authority from  
6   the Secretary of State to approve such transportation.

7       SEC. 107. During the current fiscal year and when pur-  
8   chases are made with foreign currencies, the Department of  
9   State is authorized to purchase for use abroad any passenger  
10  motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station  
11  wagons), at a cost of not to exceed the equivalent of \$2,200  
12  for each such vehicle.

13       SEC. 108. Appropriations under this title for "Sala-  
14  ries and expenses", "International contingencies", and  
15  "Missions to international organizations" are available for  
16  reimbursement of the General Services Administration for  
17  security guard services for protection of confidential files.

18       This title may be cited as the "Department of State  
19  Appropriation Act, 1952".

## 20       TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### 21       LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

#### 22       SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

23       For expenses necessary for the administration of the  
24  Department of Justice and for examination of judicial offices,  
25  including purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for re-



1 placement only; miscellaneous and emergency expenses  
2 authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his  
3 Administrative Assistant; special attorneys and special as-  
4 sistants to the Attorney General; and examination of esti-  
5 mates of appropriations in the field; \$2,250,000, *of which not*  
6 *to exceed \$2,145,690 shall be available for personal services.*

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

8 For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the  
9 Department of Justice not otherwise provided for, including  
10 miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or ap-  
11 proved by the Attorney General or his Administrative  
12 Assistant; and advances of public moneys pursuant to law  
13 (31 U. S. C. 529) ; \$9,032,000, *of which not to exceed*  
14 *\$7,774,150 shall be available for personal services.*

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

16 For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust  
17 and kindred laws, \$3,200,000, *of which not to exceed*  
18 *\$3,035,932 shall be available for personal services, and of*  
19 *which \$125,000 shall be available exclusively for activities*  
20 *in connection with railroad reparations cases: Provided, That*  
21 *none of this appropriation shall be expended for the estab-*  
22 *lishment and maintenance of permanent regional offices of*  
23 *the Antitrust Division.*

1 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS  
2 AND MARSHALS

3 For necessary expenses of the offices of United States  
4 attorneys and marshals and United States district attorneys  
5 in Alaska, including purchase of not to exceed two passenger  
6 motor vehicles (one van for replacement only at not to  
7 exceed \$2,500, and one bus for replacement only at not to  
8 exceed \$15,000) ; services in Alaska in collecting evidence  
9 for the United States when specifically directed by the  
10 Attorney General; and firearms and ammunition; \$12,990,-  
11 000, *of which not to exceed \$10,316,390 shall be available*  
12 *for personal services, and of which not to exceed \$50,000*  
13 *shall be available for the employment of temporary deputy*  
14 *marshals in lieu of bailiffs at a rate not to exceed \$10 per day.*

15 FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

16 For expenses, mileage, and per diems of witnesses and  
17 for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law;  
18 and not to exceed \$160,000 for such compensation and  
19 expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses) or infor-  
20 mants pursuant to section 1 of Public Law 626, approved  
21 July 28, 1950; \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the  
22 sum herein appropriated shall be used to pay any witness  
23 more than one attendance fee for any one calendar day.



1 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF  
2 JAPANESE ANCESTRY

3 For expenses necessary for payment of claims of persons  
4 of Japanese ancestry, pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948  
5 (50 U. S. C. 1981-1987), \$725,000, of which not to  
6 exceed \$225,000 shall be available for administrative ex-  
7 penses, *and of which not to exceed \$219,800 shall be available*  
8 *for personal services.*

9 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION  
10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; protection of the person of the President of the United States; acquisition, collection, classification and preservation of identification and other records and their exchange with the duly authorized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions; and such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General, including purchase (not to exceed four hundred for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase at not to exceed \$10,000, for replacement only, of one armored motor vehicle; firearms and ammunition; not to exceed \$150,000 for repairs and

1 alterations at the Federal Bureau of Investigation Training  
2 Center, Quantico, Virginia; not to exceed \$10,000 for taxi-  
3 cab hire to be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in  
4 this paragraph; not to exceed \$4,500 for expenses of  
5 attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the  
6 purposes of this appropriation; payment of rewards when  
7 specifically authorized by the Attorney General for infor-  
8 mation leading to the apprehension of fugitives from justice;  
9 and not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies  
10 of a confidential character, to be expended under the direc-  
11 tion of the Attorney General and to be accounted for  
12 solely on his certificate; \$90,000,000, *of which not to exceed*  
13 *\$78,473,211 shall be available for personal services: Pro-*  
14 *vided*, That of the amount herein appropriated \$100,000 is to  
15 be held as a reserve for emergencies arising in connection  
16 with kidnapping, extortion, and bank robbery, to be released  
17 for expenditure in such amounts and at such times as the At-  
18 torney General may determine: *Provided further*, That the  
19 compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be \$20,000  
20 per annum so long as the position is held by the present  
21 incumbent.

22 None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau  
23 of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of  
24 any civil-service employee.



## 1       IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

## 2                       SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3       For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
4 the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to  
5 immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, includ-  
6 ing advance of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while en  
7 route; payment of allowances (at a rate not in excess of  
8 \$1 per day) to aliens, while held in custody under the  
9 immigration laws, for work performed; payment of rewards  
10 for information leading to the apprehension or conviction  
11 of violators of the immigration laws; not to exceed  
12 \$35,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential  
13 character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney  
14 General and accounted for solely on his certificate; not to  
15 exceed \$5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of  
16 organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropria-  
17 tion; purchase (not to exceed one hundred and fifty for  
18 replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;  
19 purchase (not to exceed four for replacement only) and  
20 maintenance and operation of aircraft; firearms and ammu-  
21 nition; refunds of head tax, maintenance bills, immigra-  
22 tion fines, and other items properly returnable, except  
23 deposits of aliens who become public charges and de-  
24 posits to secure payment of fines and passage money;  
25 operation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of build-

1 ings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto;  
2 reimbursement of the General Services Administration for  
3 security guard services for protection of confidential files;  
4 and maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and  
5 transportation of alien enemies and their wives and de-  
6 pendent children, including return of such persons to place  
7 of bona fide residence or to such other place as may  
8 be authorized by the Attorney General; \$36,400,000, of  
9 which not to exceed \$30,159,900 shall be available for per-  
10 sonal services.

## 11 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

### 12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

13 For expenses necessary for the administration, opera-  
14 tion, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional  
15 institutions, including not to exceed \$490,000 for depart-  
16 mental personal services; not to exceed \$13,500 for expenses  
17 of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with  
18 the purposes of this appropriation; purchase of not to exceed  
19 fourteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only,  
20 including two busses at not to exceed \$20,000 each; com-  
21 pilation of statistics relating to prisoners in Federal and  
22 non-Federal penal and correctional institutions; furnishing  
23 of insignia, uniforms, and other distinctive wearing apparel  
24 necessary for employees in the performance of their official



1 duties; payment pursuant to law of claims of employees for  
2 loss, damage, or destruction of personal property (31  
3 U. S. C. 238); firearms and ammunition; payment of  
4 rewards for the apprehension, or for information leading to  
5 the recapture, of escaped prisoners; purchase and exchange  
6 of farm products and livestock; construction of buildings at  
7 prison camps; and acquisition of land as authorized by  
8 section 7 of the Act of July 28, 1950 (Public Law 626);  
9 \$23,500,000, *of which not to exceed \$15,387,450 shall be*  
10 *available for personal services: Provided, That* there may be  
11 transferred to the Public Health Service such amounts as  
12 may be necessary, in the discretion of the Attorney General,  
13 for direct expenditure by that Service for medical relief for  
14 inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions.

15 BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

16 For constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary  
17 buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional  
18 institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto,  
19 by contract or force account, \$470,000, of which \$360,000  
20 is for liquidation of authority granted under this head in  
21 the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1950, to enter  
22 into contracts for replacement of a power plant at the  
23 United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas: *Pro-*  
24 *vided, That* labor of United States prisoners may be used  
25 for work performed under this appropriation.

## SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For support of United States prisoners in non-Federal institutions and in the Territory of Alaska, including necessary clothing and medical aid, and payment of rewards for the apprehension, or for information leading to the recapture, of escaped prisoners; \$2,000,000, *of which not to exceed \$217,200 shall be available for personal services.*

## OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Attorney General, or such officer as he may designate, is hereby authorized to pay out of any funds or other property or interest vested in him or transferred to him pursuant to or with respect to the Trading with the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.), necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the powers and duties conferred on the Attorney General pursuant to said Act: *Provided, That not to exceed ~~\$3,600,000~~ \$3,000,000 shall be available in the current fiscal year for the general administrative expenses of the Office of Alien Property, including rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia, of which not to exceed \$2,900,000 shall be available for personal services; purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this authorization:*



1 *Provided further*, That on or before November 1 of the  
2 current fiscal year, the Attorney General shall make a report  
3 to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the  
4 House of Representatives giving detailed information on all  
5 administrative and nonadministrative expenses incurred dur-  
6 ing the next preceding fiscal year in connection with the  
7 activities of the Office of Alien Property: *Provided further*,  
8 That of the total amount herein authorized the amount of  
9 \$100,000 is to be transferred to the appropriation for  
10 "Salaries and expenses, general administration", Depart-  
11 ment of Justice.

12 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

13 SEC. 202. Not to exceed \$350,000 in the aggregate  
14 from the appropriations made in this title for general ad-  
15 ministration, general legal activities, and United States at-  
16 torneys and marshals shall be available, without regard to  
17 the Classification Act of 1949, for compensation (not to  
18 exceed \$11,000 per annum) of special attorneys and special  
19 assistants to the Attorney General and to United States  
20 attorneys not otherwise provided for: *Provided*, That re-  
21 ports be submitted to the Congress on the 1st of July and  
22 January showing the names of the persons employed under  
23 the foregoing limitation, the annual rate of compensation

1 or amount of any fee paid to each, together with a descrip-  
2 tion of their duties.

3 SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated by this title  
4 may be used to pay the compensation of any person here-  
5 after employed as an attorney (except foreign counsel em-  
6 ployed in special cases) unless such person shall be duly  
7 licensed and authorized to practice as an attorney under  
8 the laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

9 SEC. 204. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the  
10 offices of the United States attorney and the United States  
11 marshal for the District of Columbia from all appropriations  
12 in this title shall be reimbursed to the United States from  
13 any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit  
14 of the District of Columbia.

15 SEC. 205. Appropriations and authorizations made in  
16 this title which are available for expenses of attendance at  
17 meetings shall be expended for such purposes in accordance  
18 with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General.

19 SEC. 206. Appropriations and authorizations made in  
20 this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for  
21 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
22 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

23 This title may be cited as the "Department of Justice  
24 Appropriation Act, 1952".



## 1 TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## 2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the  
4 Office of the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this  
5 title referred to as the Secretary) including services as  
6 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
7 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per  
8 diem; and teletype news service (not exceeding \$1,000):  
9 ~~\$1,500,000~~ \$1,484,530, of which not to exceed \$1,363,230  
10 shall be available for personal services.

11 Technical and scientific services: For expenses neces-  
12 sary for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and  
13 engineering information to business and industry as author-  
14 ized by the Act of September 9, 1950 (Public Law 776),  
15 including not to exceed \$2,000 for services as authorized  
16 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.  
17 55a), \$250,000, of which not to exceed \$224,280 shall be  
18 available for personal services: *Provided*, That moneys here-  
19 after received by the Secretary pursuant to section 3 of said  
20 Act of September 9, 1950, for publications provided there-  
21 under, shall be available for reimbursing any appropriation  
22 as provided by said section.

## 23 BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

24 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Census: For ex-  
25 penses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing

1 current census statistics provided for by law; for searching  
2 census records and supplying information with respect to age  
3 and citizenship certification; and for general administration,  
4 including enumerators at rates to be fixed without regard  
5 to the Classification Act of 1949; and services as authorized  
6 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),  
7 at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem;  
8 \$6,500,000, *of which not to exceed \$5,623,973 shall be avail-*  
9 *able for personal services.*

10       Seventeenth decennial census: For expenses necessary  
11 for taking, compiling, and publishing the seventeenth decen-  
12 nial census including the census of housing as authorized by  
13 law (13 U. S. C. 201-219; 42 U. S. C. 1442), including  
14 personal services at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of  
15 Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949;  
16 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
17 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and compensation of employees  
18 of the Department of Commerce and other departments and  
19 independent establishments of the Government who may be  
20 detailed for field work; \$7,000,000, *of which not to exceed*  
21 *\$5,646,654 shall be available for personal services* to remain  
22 available until December 31, 1952, and to be merged with  
23 the appropriation made under this head in the Department  
24 of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1951.

25       Censuses of business, transportation, manufactures and



1 mineral industries: For expenses necessary to prepare for  
2 taking, compiling, and publishing the censuses of business,  
3 transportation, manufactures and mineral industries as  
4 authorized by law, including personal services by contract or  
5 otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce  
6 without regard to the Classification Act of 1949; services as  
7 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
8 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per  
9 diem; and additional compensation of Federal employees tem-  
10 porarily detailed for field work under this appropriation;  
11 \$200,000, *of which not to exceed \$147,812 shall be available*  
12 *for personal services*, to remain available until December  
13 31, 1953.

14 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

15 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the  
16 Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the pro-  
17 visions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended  
18 (49 U. S. C. 401), the Act of August 8, 1950 (Public  
19 Law 670), and other Acts incident to the enforcement of  
20 safety regulations; maintenance and operation of air naviga-  
21 tion facilities and air traffic control; furnishing advisory serv-  
22 ice to States and other public and private agencies in con-  
23 nection with the construction or improvement of airports  
24 and landing areas; and the disposal of surplus airports; in-  
25 cluding hire of aircraft (not exceeding \$395,000); the

1 operation and maintenance of eighty-five aircraft; contract  
2 stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of expert  
3 and other witnesses; examination of estimates of appropria-  
4 tions in the field; purchase (not to exceed twenty, for re-  
5 placement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and  
6 purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; \$99,100,000,  
7 *of which not to exceed \$75,971,477 shall be available for*  
8 *personal services*, and the Departments of the Air Force,  
9 Army and Navy are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aero-  
10 nautics Administration without charge, subject to the ap-  
11 proval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement  
12 only), aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment, and hangar,  
13 line, and shop equipment surplus to the needs of such Depart-  
14 ments: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appro-  
15 priation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities,  
16 and other public authorities for expenses incurred in the  
17 maintenance and operation of airport traffic control towers.

18 Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the ac-  
19 quisition and establishment by contract or purchase and hire  
20 of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of addi-  
21 tional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction  
22 of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling  
23 and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration  
24 and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; the



1 acquisition of the necessary sites by lease, condemnation or  
2 grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related  
3 accommodations for officers and employees of the Civil Aero-  
4 nautics Administration and the Weather Bureau stationed at  
5 remote localities not on foreign soil where such accommoda-  
6 tions are not otherwise available; hire of passenger motor  
7 vehicles; and not to exceed \$200,000 for emergency repairs  
8 and replacement of facilities damaged by fire, flood, or storm;  
9 to remain available until expended, ~~\$20,000,000~~ \$25,000,000,  
10 of which not to exceed \$4,965,300 shall be available for per-  
11 sonal services, and of which \$12,000,000 is for liquidation of  
12 obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to  
13 enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes: *Provided*,  
14 That authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into  
15 contracts for such purposes may be exercised until June 30,  
16 1952 and may hereafter be accounted for under this head:  
17 *Provided further*, That the consolidated appropriation under  
18 this head for the next preceding fiscal year is hereby  
19 consolidated with and made a part of this appropriation  
20 to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund: *Provided*  
21 *further*, That transfers may be made from this appropri-  
22 ation to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil  
23 Aeronautics Administration", for costs of maintenance  
24 and operation of aircraft for initial flight checking of  
25 facilities established under this appropriation (not to

1 exceed \$325,000) ; for necessary expenses in connection  
2 with the transportation by air to and from and within the  
3 Territories of the United States of materials and equipment  
4 secured under this appropriation (not to exceed \$115,000) ;  
5 and for necessary administrative costs (not to exceed \$325,-  
6 000) : *Provided further*, That the Departments of the Army,  
7 Navy, and Air Force are authorized during the current fiscal  
8 year to transfer without charge, subject to the approval of  
9 the Bureau of the Budget, air-navigation and communication  
10 facilities, including appurtenances thereto, to the Civil Aero-  
11 nautics Administration.

12       Technical development and evaluation: For expenses  
13 necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aero-  
14 nautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), relative  
15 to such developmental work and service testing as tends to  
16 the creation of improved air-navigation facilities, including  
17 landing areas, aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances,  
18 personnel, and operation methods; acquisition of necessary  
19 sites by lease or grant; and operation and maintenance of five  
20 aircraft, which shall be in addition to the number authorized  
21 herein under the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses,  
22 Civil Aeronautics Administration"; \$1,200,000, *of which not*  
23 *to exceed \$916,063 shall be available for personal services.*

24       Maintenance and operation, Washington National Air-  
25 port: For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-



1 nance, and protection of the Washington National Airport,  
 2 including purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for re-  
 3 placement only; not to exceed \$3,500 for the purchase,  
 4 cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition;  
 5 ~~\$1,300,000~~ \$1,257,984, of which not to exceed \$828,145  
 6 shall be available for personal services.

7 Construction, Washington National Airport: For an  
 8 additional amount for construction at the Washington Na-  
 9 tional Airport, \$75,000, to remain available until expended.

10 Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For  
 11 carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of  
 12 May 13, 1946, as amended (except section 5 (a) ), to be  
 13 available until June 30, ~~1954~~ 1958, ~~\$35,840,000~~ \$28,700,-  
 14 000, of which (1) ~~\$17,000,000~~ \$15,000,000 shall be for  
 15 projects in the States in accordance with section 6 of said  
 16 Act, (2) \$470,000 for projects in Puerto Rico, (3) \$30,000  
 17 for projects in the Virgin Islands, (4) \$300,000 for projects  
 18 in the Territory of Hawaii, (5) \$200,000 for projects in  
 19 the Territory of Alaska, (6) ~~\$15,000,000~~ \$10,000,000  
 20 for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority here-  
 21 tofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing pur-  
 22 poses and (7) ~~\$2,840,000~~ \$2,700,000 shall be available  
 23 as one fund for necessary planning, research, and adminis-  
 24 trative expenses; including hire of passenger motor vehicles;  
 25 of which ~~\$2,840,000~~ \$2,700,000 not to exceed ~~\$500,000~~

1 ~~\$450,000~~ may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries  
 2 and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration", to provide  
 3 for necessary administrative expenses, including the mainte-  
 4 nance and operation of aircraft, *and not to exceed \$1,937,447*  
 5 *shall be available for personal services: Provided, That the*  
 6 appropriation under this head for the next preceding fiscal  
 7 year is hereby merged with this appropriation and the con-  
 8 tract authorized heretofore granted for the foregoing pur-  
 9 poses may hereafter be accounted for under this head.

10 Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory  
 11 of Alaska: For expenses necessary for the maintenance, im-  
 12 provement, and operation of public airports in the Territory  
 13 of Alaska, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 485 c-h);  
 14 including arms and ammunition; ~~\$225,000~~ *\$350,000, of*  
 15 *which not to exceed \$315,753 shall be available for personal*  
 16 *services.*

17 Air navigation development: For liquidation of obliga-  
 18 tions incurred under authority heretofore granted under this  
 19 head to enter into contracts ~~\$1,883,000~~ *\$1,874,562, of which*  
 20 *not to exceed \$75,937 shall be available for personal services:*  
 21 *Provided, That the appropriation granted under this head for*  
 22 *the fiscal year 1951 shall remain available during the current*  
 23 *fiscal year and may hereafter be accounted for under this*  
 24 *head, and not to exceed \$80,000 of such appropriation shall*  
 25 *be available for administrative expenses.*



1        *Transport Aircraft Development: For expenses necessary*  
2 *for carrying out the provisions of the Act of September 30,*  
3 *1950 (Public Law 867), relating to the development of*  
4 *improved transport aircraft including hire of aircraft; and*  
5 *services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,*  
6 *1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in*  
7 *excess of \$50 per diem; \$597,500, to remain available until*  
8 *expended, of which not to exceed \$22,500 shall be available*  
9 *for personal services.*

10 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including contract stenographic reporting services; employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or industries serving aviation; expenses of examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; *purchase (not to exceed four for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; \$3,550,000 \$3,700,000, of which not to exceed \$3,354,000 shall be available for personal services: Provided, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Board without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for*

1 replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, and accessories  
2 surplus to the needs of such Departments.

3 COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry  
5 out the provisions of the Act of August 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C.  
6 883a-883i), including purchase of not to exceed four pas-  
7 senger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of sites and  
8 the erection of temporary buildings for tide, magnetic or  
9 seismological observations; hire of aircraft; operation,  
10 maintenance, and repair of an airplane; extra compensation  
11 at not to exceed \$15 per month to each member of the  
12 crew of a vessel when assigned duties as recorder or instru-  
13 ment observer, and at not to exceed \$1 per day for each  
14 station to employees of other Federal agencies while making  
15 oceanographic observations or tending seismographs; not to  
16 exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of  
17 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); pay, allow-  
18 ances, gratuities, transportation of dependents and house-  
19 hold effects, and payment of funeral expenses, as authorized  
20 by law, for not to exceed 185 commissioned officers on the  
21 active list; and pay of commissioned officers retired in ac-  
22 cordance with law; ~~\$12,375,000~~ \$11,877,688, of which not  
23 to exceed \$8,075,810 shall be available for personal services:  
24 *Provided*, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and  
25 Air Force are authorized during the current fiscal year to



1 transfer without reimbursement to the Coast and Geodetic  
2 Survey, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,  
3 landing craft, launches, marine engines, electronic equipment,  
4 automotive vehicles, parts, equipment, and supplies, excess to  
5 the needs of such Departments, which will serve to expedite  
6 surveys in Alaska for national defense: *Provided further,*  
7 That during the current fiscal year, this appropriation shall be  
8 reimbursed (to the extent and in the manner required by law  
9 (44 U. S. C. 246) for charts sold to the general public) for  
10 charts published by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and  
11 furnished for the official use of the military departments of  
12 the Department of Defense.

13 BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

14 Departmental salaries and expenses: For necessary  
15 expenses of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce  
16 at the seat of government, including the purchase of com-  
17 mercial and trade reports, and not to exceed \$50,000 for  
18 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
19 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$3,000,000, *of which not to exceed*  
20 *\$2,641,869 shall be available for personal services: Provided,*  
21 That expenses of field studies or surveys conducted by depart-  
22 mental personnel of the Bureau shall be payable from the  
23 amount herein appropriated.

24 Field office service: For expenses necessary to operate  
25 and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices

1 for the collection and dissemination of information useful in  
2 the development and improvement of commerce throughout  
3 the United States and its possessions, including not to exceed  
4 \$90,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,  
5 ~~\$1,900,000~~ \$1,953,000, of which not to exceed \$1,593,000  
6 shall be available for personal services.

7 Export control: For expenses necessary for carrying  
8 out the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949, as  
9 amended, relating to export controls, including services as  
10 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
11 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem  
12 for individuals, ~~\$5,500,000~~ \$5,388,180, of which not to  
13 exceed \$4,606,380 shall be available for personal services,  
14 and of which not to exceed \$1,277,000 may be transferred  
15 to the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, for en-  
16 forcement of the export control program, and of which not  
17 to exceed \$100,000 may be transferred to the appropria-  
18 tion for "Salaries and expenses" under the Office of the  
19 Secretary.

20 PATENT OFFICE

21 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, includ-  
22 ing services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
23 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to  
24 exceed \$75 per diem (not to exceed \$25,000); expenses of  
25 transporting to foreign governments publications of patents



1 issued by the Patent Office; defense of suits instituted against  
2 the Commissioner of Patents; and other contingent expenses  
3 of the Patent Office: *Provided*, That the headings of the  
4 drawings for patented cases may be multigraphed in the  
5 Patent Office for the purpose of photolithography, \$11,-  
6 500,000, *of which not to exceed \$8,834,000 shall be available*  
7 *for personal services.*

8 BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

9 General administrative expenses: Necessary expenses of  
10 administration, including advertising (including advertising  
11 in the city of Washington for work to be performed in areas  
12 adjacent thereto), purchase of fifty passenger motor vehicles  
13 for replacement only, and the maintenance and repairs of  
14 experimental highways, shall be paid, in accordance with  
15 law, from appropriations available to the Bureau of Public  
16 Roads.

17 Of the total amount available from appropriations of  
18 the Bureau of Public Roads for general administrative ex-  
19 penses, pursuant to the provisions of section 21 of the Act  
20 of November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 21),  
21 \$100,000 shall be available for all necessary expenses to  
22 enable the President to utilize the services of the Bureau of  
23 Public Roads in fulfilling the obligations of the United  
24 States under the Convention on the Pan-American High-  
25 way Between the United States and Other American Re-

1   publics (51 Stat. 152), cooperation with several govern-  
2   ments, members of the Pan American Union, in connection  
3   with the survey and construction of the Inter-American  
4   Highway, and for performing engineering service in Pan-  
5   American countries for and upon the request of any agency  
6   or governmental corporation of the United States.

7       Federal-aid highways: For carrying out the provisions  
8   of the Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented  
9   (23 U. S. C. 1-22, 24-105, 107-117), to remain available  
10   until expended, *including not to exceed \$8,563,500 for per-*  
11   *sonal services*, \$325,000,000, which sum is composed of  
12   \$320,000,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appro-  
13   priated for the fiscal year 1950, and \$3,214,713 and  
14   \$1,785,287, the latter sums being for reimbursement of the  
15   sums expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways  
16   and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by floods,  
17   hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by section 4 of the Act  
18   approved June 8, 1938, and section 7 of the Act approved  
19   July 13, 1943 (23 U. S. C. 13a and 13b).

20       Elimination of grade crossings: For the elimination  
21   of hazards to life at railroad grade crossings, to remain  
22   available until expended, \$3,000,000, which sum is a part  
23   of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal  
24   year 1943 by section 5 of the Act approved September 5,



1 1940 (54 Stat. 869) : *Provided*, That the amounts author-  
2 ized for the elimination of grade crossing hazards by said  
3 section and apportioned to Hawaii are hereby reduced by  
4 \$188,075.

5 Forest highways: For expenses, not otherwise provided  
6 for, necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23  
7 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as  
8 amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), to remain available  
9 until expended, \$21,000,000, which sum is composed of  
10 \$2,400,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be  
11 appropriated for the fiscal year 1950, and \$18,600,000, a  
12 part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal  
13 year 1951, *and of which not to exceed \$2,914,200 shall be*  
14 *available for personal services: Provided*, That this appro-  
15 priation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construc-  
16 tion, or alteration of buildings and sites necessary for the  
17 storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road  
18 construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such  
19 item under this authorization shall not exceed \$15,000.

20 *Public Lands Highways: For the purpose of carrying*  
21 *out the provisions of section 10 of the Act of September 7,*  
22 *1950, \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended.*

23 Tongass Forest Highways, Alaska: For surveys, con-  
24 struction, reconstruction, and maintenance of Tongass forest  
25 highways in Alaska in accordance with the provisions of

1 section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950,  
2 ~~\$3,500,000~~ \$3,480,000, of which not to exceed \$180,000  
3 shall be available for personal services, to remain available  
4 until expended.

5 Access roads: During the current fiscal year, not to  
6 exceed \$70,000 of funds remaining unexpended upon com-  
7 pletion of access road projects authorized to be constructed  
8 under the provisions of the Defense Highway Act of 1941,  
9 as amended by the Act of July 2, 1942 (23 U. S. C. 106),  
10 shall be available for the maintenance of roads and bridges  
11 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Roads on  
12 Government-owned land in Arlington County, Virginia.

13 War and emergency damage, Territory of Hawaii:  
14 For the liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to  
15 authority granted under this head in the Independent Offices  
16 Appropriation Act, 1948, \$2,000,000, to remain available  
17 until expended.

18 Inter-American Highway: For necessary expenses of  
19 continuing the survey and construction of the Inter-American  
20 Highway, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of  
21 December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section  
22 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, ~~\$4,000,000~~  
23 \$2,000,000, of which not to exceed \$315,900 shall be avail-  
24 able for personal services, to remain available until expended.

25 Access roads (Act of September 7, 1950): For an



1 additional amount for "Access roads (Act of September 7,  
2 1950) ", ~~\$1,000,000~~ \$3,000,000, to remain available until  
3 expended.

4 General provisions—Bureau of Public Roads: None of  
5 the money appropriated for the work of the Bureau of Public  
6 Roads during the current fiscal year shall be paid to any  
7 State on account of any project on which convict labor shall  
8 be employed, but this provision shall not apply to labor  
9 performed by convicts on parole or probation.

10 During the current fiscal year authorized engineering or  
11 other services in connection with the survey, construction,  
12 and maintenance, or improvement of roads may be per-  
13 formed for other Government agencies, cooperating foreign  
14 countries and State cooperating agencies and reimbursement  
15 for such services (which may include depreciation on engi-  
16 neering and road-building equipment used) shall be credited  
17 to the appropriation concerned.

18 During the current fiscal year appropriations for the  
19 work of the Bureau of Public Roads shall be available for  
20 expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement,  
21 care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment  
22 for distribution to projects under the supervision of the  
23 Bureau of Public Roads, or for sale or distribution to other  
24 Government activities, cooperating foreign countries and  
25 State cooperating agencies, and the cost of such supplies

1 and materials or the value of such equipment (including the  
2 cost of transportation and handling) may be reimbursed to  
3 current applicable appropriations.

4 Appropriations to the Bureau of Public Roads may be  
5 used in emergency for medical supplies and services and  
6 other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of em-  
7 ployees engaged on hazardous work under that Bureau, and  
8 for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the  
9 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates for  
10 individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem.

11 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

12 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions  
13 of the Act approved March 3, 1901, as amended (15  
14 U. S. C. 271-278; Public Law 619, approved July 22,  
15 1950), including not to exceed \$700,000 for improvements  
16 to buildings, grounds, and other plant facilities, as author-  
17 ized by section 2 of the Act of July 21, 1950 (Public  
18 Law 618); building of temporary experimental structures;  
19 purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for  
20 replacement only; and not to exceed \$100,000 for services  
21 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
22 (5 U. S. C. 55a); as follows:

23 Operation and administration: For the general opera-  
24 tion and administration of the Bureau; improvement and  
25 care of the grounds; plant equipment; and maintenance and



1 protection of buildings, including repairs and alterations  
 2 thereto; \$1,100,000, of which not to exceed \$490,203 shall  
 3 be available for personal services.

4 Research and testing: For research, testing and other  
 5 activities, as authorized by the Act of July 22, 1950 (Public  
 6 Law 619), and not otherwise provided for, ~~\$4,000,000~~  
 7 \$3,807,419, of which not to exceed \$3,083,228 shall be  
 8 available for personal services.

9 Radio propagation and standards: For development and  
 10 maintenance of primary standards of measurement of elec-  
 11 trical quantities at radio frequencies; calibrating and certify-  
 12 ing radio measuring instruments, apparatus, and standards in  
 13 terms of the national primary standards; investigation of the  
 14 phenomena affecting the propagation of radio waves; and  
 15 the broadcasting of radio signals of standard frequency;  
 16 ~~\$2,800,000~~ \$2,735,220, of which not to exceed \$1,483,020  
 17 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That  
 18 during the current fiscal year the maximum base rate  
 19 of compensation for employees appointed pursuant to  
 20 the Act of July 21, 1950 (Public Law 618), shall  
 21 be \$6,400 per annum: *Provided further*, That the  
 22 Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are

1 authorized, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the  
2 Budget, to transfer without charge to the National Bureau  
3 of Standards materials, equipment, and supplies, surplus to  
4 their needs and necessary for the establishment, maintenance,  
5 and operation of Arctic ionosphere observation  
6 stations.

7 Construction of laboratories: For payment of obligations  
8 incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head  
9 in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1951,  
10 \$3,800,000, to remain available until expended.

11 ~~Working capital fund: For an additional amount for~~  
12 ~~the "Working capital fund", established by the Deficiency~~  
13 ~~Appropriation Act, 1950, \$2,000,000, to be available without~~  
14 ~~fiscal year limitation.~~

15 WEATHER BUREAU

16 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the  
17 Weather Bureau, including maintenance and operation of aircraft;  
18 not to exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized by  
19 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;  
20 not to exceed \$10,000 for maintenance of a printing office in  
21 the City of Washington, as authorized by law; and not to  
22 exceed \$10,000 for the United States contribution to the



1 cost of the secretariat of the International Meteorological  
2 Committee; ~~\$26,000,000~~ \$25,069,477, of which not to exceed  
3 \$18,229,710 shall be available for personal services: *Pro-*  
4 *vided*, That during the current fiscal year, the maximum  
5 amount authorized under section 3 (a) of the Act of  
6 June 2, 1948 (15 U. S. C. 327), for extra com-  
7 pensation to employees of other Government agencies for  
8 taking and transmitting meteorological observations, shall  
9 be \$5 per day; and the maximum base rate of pay authorized  
10 under section 3 (b) of said Act, for employees conducting  
11 meteorological investigations in the Arctic region, shall be  
12 \$5,000 per annum, except that not more than five of such  
13 employees at any one time may receive a base rate of \$7,500  
14 per annum, and such employees may be appointed without  
15 regard to the Classification Act of 1949: *Provided further*,  
16 That such sums, as may be determined by the Director of  
17 the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary, may be transferred  
18 from this appropriation to the appropriation to the Depart-  
19 ment of State for "Contributions to International Organi-  
20 zations, 1952", for contribution to the International Civil  
21 Aviation Organization for the United States share of the  
22 costs of the meteorological installation in Iceland, when said  
23 installation is transferred for operation under the "Agree-  
24 ment on Air Navigation Services in Iceland".

## 1       GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

2       SEC. 302. During the current fiscal year applicable ap-  
3       propriations and funds available to the Department of Com-  
4       merce shall be available for the activities specified in the  
5       Act of October 26, 1949 (Public Law 390), to the extent  
6       and in the manner prescribed by said Act.

7       SEC. 303. Appropriations of the Department of Com-  
8       merce available for salaries and expenses shall be avail-  
9       able for attendance at meetings of organizations concerned  
10      with the activities for which the appropriations are made.

11      SEC. 304. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6  
12      of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the  
13      provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce  
14      may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal  
15      year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee  
16      of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem  
17      such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests  
18      of the United States.

19      *SEC. 305. Appropriations of the Department of Com-*  
20      *merce available for salaries and expenses shall be available*  
21      *in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 for entertainment within*  
22      *or outside the United States of prominent persons, representa-*  
23      *tives, and dignitaries of foreign governments. The cost of*  
24      *such entertainment, including the reimbursement of officials*



1 *of the Department of Commerce who have incurred expenses*  
2 *for such entertainment, shall be accounted for solely on the*  
3 *certificate of the Secretary of Commerce.*

4       This title may be cited as the “Department of Commerce  
5 Appropriation Act, 1952”.

6                   **TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY**

7                   **SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

8                               **SALARIES**

9       For the Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices, and  
10 all other officers and employees, whose compensation shall  
11 be fixed by the Court, except as otherwise provided by law,  
12 and who may be employed and assigned by the Chief Justice  
13 to any office or work of the Court, \$928,000.

14                   **PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS**

15       For printing and binding the advance opinions, prelimi-  
16 nary prints, and bound reports of the Court, \$91,200.

17                               **MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES**

18       For miscellaneous expenses to be expended as the Chief  
19 Justice may approve, \$58,350.

20                   **CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS**

21       For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the  
22 Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed upon  
23 him by the Act approved May 7, 1934 (40 U. S. C.  
24 13a-13d), including improvements, maintenance, repairs,

1 equipment, supplies, materials, and appurtenances; special  
2 clothing for workmen; and personal and other services  
3 (including temporary labor without reference to the Classi-  
4 fication and Retirement Acts, as amended), and for snow  
5 removal by hire of men and equipment or under contract  
6 without compliance with sections 3709, as amended, and  
7 3744 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5, 16);  
8 \$160,700, *of which not to exceed \$144,000 shall be available*  
9 *for personal services.*

#### 10 COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

##### 11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges, and  
13 all other officers and employees of the court, and necessary  
14 expenses of the court, including exchange of books, and  
15 traveling expenses, as may be approved by the chief judge,  
16 \$194,500, *of which not to exceed \$176,715 shall be available*  
17 *for personal services.*

#### 18 CUSTOMS COURT

##### 19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For salaries of the chief judge, eight judges, and all other  
21 officers and employees of the court, and necessary expenses  
22 of the court, including exchange of books, and traveling  
23 expenses, as may be approved by the chief judge, \$433,165,  
24 *of which not to exceed \$401,165 shall be available for*



1 *personal services: Provided, That* traveling expenses of  
2 judges of the Customs Court shall be paid upon the written  
3 certificate of the judge.

4 COURT OF CLAIMS

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges,  
7 seven regular and six additional commissioners, and all other  
8 officers and employees of the court, and for other necessary  
9 expenses, including stenographic and other fees and charges  
10 necessary in the taking of testimony, and travel, \$579,800,  
11 *of which not to exceed \$495,580 shall be available for*  
12 *personal services.*

13 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS

14 For necessary repairs and improvements to the Court  
15 of Claims buildings, to be expended under the supervision  
16 of the Architect of the Capitol, \$9,100.

17 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

18 HAWAII

19 For salaries of the chief justice and two associate justices  
20 of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, of judges  
21 of the circuit courts in Hawaii, and of judges retired under  
22 title 28, United States Code, section 373, \$120,000.

23 SALARIES OF JUDGES

24 For salaries of circuit judges; district judges (including

1 judges of the district courts of Alaska, the Virgin Islands,  
2 the Panama Canal Zone, and Guam) ; and justices and  
3 judges retired or resigned under title 28, United States  
4 Code, sections 371, 372, and 373 ; \$5,120,000.

5 SALARIES OF CLERKS OF COURTS

6 For salaries of clerks of United States courts of appeals  
7 and United States district courts, their deputies, and other  
8 assistants, \$4,520,000.

9 PROBATION SYSTEM

10 For salaries of probation officers and their clerical as-  
11 sistants, as authorized by title 18, United States Code,  
12 sections 3654 and 3656, \$2,180,000: *Provided*, That  
13 nothing herein contained shall be construed to abridge  
14 the right of the district judges to appoint probation  
15 officers, or to make such orders as may be necessary to  
16 govern probation officers in their own courts: *Provided*  
17 *further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used  
18 to pay the salary or expenses of any probation officer who,  
19 in the judgment of the chief or presiding judge certified to  
20 the Attorney General, fails to carry out the official orders  
21 of the Attorney General with respect to supervising or fur-  
22 nishing information concerning any prisoner released con-  
23 ditionally or on parole from any Federal penal or correctional  
24 institution.



## 1 SALARIES OF CRIERS

2 For salaries of criers as authorized by title 28, United  
3 States Code, sections 713 (a) and 755, \$542,300.

## 4 FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

5 For fees of the United States commissioners and other  
6 committing magistrates acting under title 18, United States  
7 Code, section 3041, including fees and expenses of concili-  
8 ation commissioners, United States courts, including the  
9 objects and subject to the conditions specified for such fees  
10 and expenses of conciliation commissioners in the Depart-  
11 ment of Justice Appropriation Act, 1937, \$543,000.

## 12 FEES OF JURORS

13 For fees, expenses, and costs of jurors; meals and lodging  
14 for jurors in Alaska, as provided by section 193, title II, of  
15 the Act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 362); and compensation  
16 for jury commissioners; \$2,800,000: *Provided*, That the  
17 compensation of jury commissioners for the District of  
18 Columbia shall conform to the provisions of section 1401,  
19 title 11 of the District of Columbia Code.

20 MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

21 For salaries of all officials and employees of the  
22 Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for,  
23 \$2,670,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secre-  
24 taries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall  
25 be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office

1 without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, except  
2 that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the  
3 General Schedule grades (GS) 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, as the ap-  
4 pointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk  
5 shall conform with that of the General Schedule grades  
6 (GS) 5, 7, 9, 11, or 12, as the appointing judge shall deter-  
7 mine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit  
8 if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge  
9 otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of,  
10 step-increases corresponding with those provided for by title  
11 VII of the Classification Act of 1949 and of compensation  
12 paid for temporary assistance needed because of an emer-  
13 gency) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law  
14 clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed \$9,600 per  
15 annum, except in the case of the chief judge of each circuit  
16 and the chief judge of each district court having five or more  
17 district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not  
18 exceed \$13,050 per annum.

#### 19 MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

20 For miscellaneous expenses of the United States courts  
21 and their officers; rent in the District of Columbia; pur-  
22 chase of firearms and ammunition; and purchase of en-  
23 velopes without regard to the Act of June 26, 1906 (34  
24 Stat. 476) ; ~~\$750,000~~ \$768,750: *Provided*, That this appro-  
25 priation shall be available for payment of the cost of contract



1 statistical services for the Office of Register of Wills of the  
2 District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That not to exceed  
3 \$1,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the pay-  
4 ment of fees to attorneys appointed in accordance with the  
5 Act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 625), not exceeding \$25 in  
6 any one case.

7 TRAVEL EXPENSES

8 For necessary traveling expenses, not otherwise provided  
9 for, incurred by the Judiciary, including traveling expenses  
10 of probation officers and their clerks, \$715,000: *Provided*,  
11 That this sum shall be available, in an amount not to exceed  
12 \$8,500, for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned  
13 with the work of Federal probation when incurred on the  
14 written authorization of the Director of the Administrative  
15 Office of the United States Courts.

16 SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

17 For salaries of court reporters for the district courts of  
18 the United States, as authorized by title 28, United States  
19 Code, section 753, \$988,200.

20 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

21 For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of  
22 the United States Courts, including travel, advertising, rent  
23 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and examination  
24 of estimates for appropriations in the field, \$535,000, of

1 *which not to exceed \$488,500 shall be available for personal*  
2 *services.*

3 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, DISTRICT COURT OF THE  
4 UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

5 For repairs and improvements to the courthouse, includ-  
6 ing repair and maintenance of the mechanical equipment,  
7 and for labor and material and every item incident thereto,  
8 \$7,100, to be expended under the direction of the Architect  
9 of the Capitol.

10 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, UNITED STATES COURT OF  
11 APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

12 For repairs and improvements to the United States  
13 Court of Appeals Building, including repair and maintenance  
14 of the mechanical equipment and for labor and material  
15 and every item incident thereto, \$3,700, to be expended  
16 under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

17 SALARIES OF REFEREES

18 For salaries of referees as authorized by the Act of  
19 June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68). \$879,000 to be derived  
20 from the referees' salary fund established in pursuance of  
21 said Act.

22 EXPENSES OF REFEREES

23 For miscellaneous expenses of referees, United States  
24 courts, including the salaries of their clerical assistants,



1 travel, purchase of envelopes without regard to the Act of  
2 June 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 476), \$1,090,000, to be derived  
3 from the referees' expense fund established in pursuance of  
4 the Act of June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68 (c) (4)), of  
5 *which not to exceed \$800,010 shall be available for personal*  
6 *services.*

7 GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

8 SEC. 402. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the  
9 District Court of the United States for the District of  
10 Columbia from all appropriations under this title and 30 per  
11 centum of the expenditures for the United States Court of  
12 Appeals for the District of Columbia from all appropriations  
13 under this title shall be reimbursed to the United States  
14 from any funds in the Treasury to the credit of the District  
15 of Columbia.

16 SEC. 403. The reports of the United States Court of  
17 Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not be sold for a  
18 price exceeding that approved by the court and for not more  
19 than \$6.50 per volume.

20 This title may be cited as the "Judiciary Appropriation  
21 Act, 1952".

22 TITLE V—FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES,  
23 INCORPORATED

24 The following corporation is hereby authorized to make  
25 such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing

1 authority available to such corporation, and in accord with  
2 law, and to make such contracts and commitments without  
3 regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104  
4 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as  
5 may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in  
6 the Budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation,  
7 except as hereinafter provided:

8       Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated: Not to exceed  
9 \$327,000 of the funds of the Corporation shall be available  
10 for its administrative expenses, *including not to exceed \$263,-*  
11 *274 for personal services*, and not to exceed \$404,000 for  
12 the expenses of vocational training of prisoners, *including*  
13 *not to exceed \$344,796 for personal services*, both amounts to  
14 be computed on an accrual basis and to be determined in  
15 accordance with the Corporation's prescribed accounting  
16 system in effect on July 1, 1946, and shall be exclusive of  
17 depreciation, payment of claims, expenditures which the said  
18 accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to  
19 cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling  
20 and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with  
21 acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improve-  
22 ment, protection, or disposition of facilities and other prop-  
23 erty belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an  
24 interest.



## 1 TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in  
3 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-  
4 poration included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary  
5 or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the  
6 Government of the United States or who is a member of an  
7 organization of Government employees that asserts the right  
8 to strike against the Government of the United States, or who  
9 advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,  
10 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by  
11 force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an  
12 affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the  
13 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions  
14 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of  
15 the United States, is not a member of an organization of  
16 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against  
17 the Government of the United States, or that such person  
18 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization  
19 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the  
20 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That  
21 any person who engages in a strike against the Government  
22 of the United States or who is a member of an organization  
23 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike  
24 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-  
25 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,

1 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by  
2 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or  
3 wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund  
4 contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon  
5 conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned  
6 for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That  
7 the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in  
8 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

9       ~~SEC. 602.~~ None of the funds appropriated in this Act  
10 shall be used to pay an assessment to any international  
11 organization which exceeds one-third of the total annual  
12 cost thereof.

13       *SEC. 602.* No representative of the United States Gov-  
14 ernment in any international organization hereafter shall  
15 make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds  
16 for a contribution by the United States in excess of  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per  
17 centum of the budget of any international organization for  
18 which the appropriation for the United States contribution  
19 is contained in this Act: *Provided*, That in exceptional cir-  
20 cumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States  
21 in excess of  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per centum of the budget, a commitment  
22 requiring a United States appropriation of a larger pro-  
23 portion may be made after consultation by United States  
24 representatives in the organization or other appropriate  
25 officials of the Department of State with the Committees on



1 *Appropriation of the Senate and House of Representatives:*  
 2 *Provided, however, That this section shall not apply to the*  
 3 *United States representatives to the Inter-American*  
 4 *organizations.*

5       ~~SEC. 603.~~ No part of any appropriation or authorization  
 6 contained in this Act shall be used to pay compensation  
 7 of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position  
 8 which may become vacant after August 1, 1951 through  
 9 the fiscal year 1952: *Provided, That this inhibition shall*  
 10 *not apply—*

11       ~~(a)~~ to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

12       ~~(b)~~ to positions filled from within the agency;

13       ~~(c)~~ to offices or positions required by law to be filled  
 14 by appointment of the President by and with the advice and  
 15 consent of the Senate;

16       ~~(d)~~ to the Department of Justice, except general ad-  
 17 ministration personnel;

18       ~~(e)~~ to the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

19       ~~(f)~~ to the Judiciary Branch;

20       ~~(g)~~ to the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

21       ~~(h)~~ to employees in grades GPC 1 and 2:

22 *Provided further, That when any department or agency*  
 23 *covered in this Act has reduced their employment rolls to*  
 24 *80 per centum of the total number on their rolls as of August*  
 25 *1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply.*

1     *SEC. 603. No part of any appropriation contained in*  
2     *this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee*  
3     *engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would*  
4     *be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred*  
5     *and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and inter-*  
6     *mittent employees of the agency concerned: Provided, That*  
7     *for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as*  
8     *engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in*  
9     *personnel administration consisting of direction and adminis-*  
10    *tration of the personnel program; employment, placement,*  
11    *and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee*  
12    *relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners*  
13    *and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administra-*  
14    *tion; and processing, recording, and reporting.*

15     *SEC. 604. Except for the automobiles officially assigned*  
16     *to the Secretary of State, the Attorney General and the Secre-*  
17     *tary of Commerce and automobiles assigned for operation by*  
18     *the Federal Bureau of Investigation, no part of any appro-*  
19     *priation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the com-*  
20     *ensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the*  
21     *District of Columbia whose primary duties consist of acting*  
22     *as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor ve-*  
23     *hicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appro-*  
24     *priation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the*  
25     *compensation of employees performing such duties.*



1        *SEC. 605. No part of the money appropriated by this*  
2 *Act to any department or made available for expenditure by*  
3 *any corporation contained in this Act which is in excess of*  
4 *75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensa-*  
5 *tion of all persons the aggregate budget estimates for personal*  
6 *services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal*  
7 *year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such depart-*  
8 *ment or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance*  
9 *of—*

10            *(1) functions performed by a person designated*  
11 *as an information specialist, information and editorial*  
12 *specialist, publications and information coordinator,*  
13 *press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio*  
14 *expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or pub-*  
15 *licity expert, or designated by any similar title, or*

16            *(2) functions performed by persons who assist per-*  
17 *sons performing the functions described in (1) in draft-*  
18 *ing, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or dissemi-*  
19 *nating public information publications or releases, radio*  
20 *or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, mo-*  
21 *tion pictures, and similar material,*

22 *shall be available to pay the compensation of persons perform-*  
23 *ing the functions described in (1) or (2). No person whose*  
24 *only performance of the functions described in (1) or (2)*

1 of the preceding sentence is in activities necessary for the  
2 enforcement of law, promotion of safety of human life,  
3 dissemination of weather information, or scientific experi-  
4 mentation, or whose compensation is paid from funds appro-  
5 priated specifically for International Information and  
6 Educational Activities shall be deemed to be engaged in the  
7 performance of the functions so described.

8       SEC. 606. The Director of the Federal Bureau of In-  
9 vestigation, United States Department of Justice, hereafter  
10 is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classifica-  
11 tion Act of 1949 to place two positions in grade GS-18, and  
12 seven positions in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule  
13 established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such posi-  
14 tions shall be in lieu of any positions in the Federal Bureau  
15 of Investigation previously allocated under section 505. The  
16 compensation of the Associate Director of the Federal  
17 Bureau of Investigation hereafter shall be \$17,500 per  
18 annum.

19       The Secretary of State hereafter is authorized without  
20 regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to  
21 place one additional position in grade GS-17 in the General  
22 Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949.

23       The Secretary of Commerce hereafter is authorized  
24 without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of



1 1949 to place one additional position in grade GS-17 in  
2 the General Schedule established by the Classification Act  
3 of 1949.

4 SEC. ~~604~~ 607. This Act may be cited as the "Depart-  
5 ments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary  
6 Appropriation Act, 1952".

Passed the House of Representatives July 26, 1951.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*





82<sup>ND</sup> CONGRESS  
1<sup>ST</sup> SESSION

**H. R. 4740**

[Report No. 697]

---

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

---

---

JULY 27 (legislative day, JULY 24), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Appropriations

AUGUST 21 (legislative day, AUGUST 1), 1951

Reported with amendments







share nor surrender its rightful place of honor.

I have seen the flags of other countries displayed many times in equal prominence with our own, and even in greater prominence. On numerous occasions also the flag of the United Nations has been flown in our country higher and more prominently than our own Star Spangled Banner.

I notice that the patriotic women of the Daughters of the American Revolution too, have been disturbed to find other flags receiving greater honor than the American flag in the United States. Last April, at its sixtieth continental congress, the DAR took cognizance of the situation. A resolution was passed urging that our flag always occupy the position of highest honor.

Mr. President, it should not be necessary for the DAR to vote such resolutions. It should not be necessary for me to introduce such legislation. But, unfortunately, there are those in America who treat our flag too casually and too indifferently. There are even those who spurn it.

Briefly, my bill is an amendment to the United States Code. It would prohibit the display of other flags equally with, above, or in place of, the flag of the United States.

One exception is made. At the headquarters of the United Nations in New York, or at any other place in the country where there is an official meeting or proceeding of the United Nations, the flag of the United States may take precedence.

I hope the Congress will give this legislation the early and favorable consideration it deserves.

#### APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL POLICEMEN BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to appoint special policemen for duty upon certain Federal property under the control of the Secretary of Commerce, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce addressed to the President of the Senate, dated August 13, 1951, together with a statement of the purpose and need for the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2040) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to appoint special policemen for duty upon certain Federal property under the control of the Secretary of Commerce, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter and statement are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, August 13, 1951.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,  
President of the Senate, United States  
Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I recommend to the Congress for its consideration the attached draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to appoint special police-

men for duty upon certain Federal property under the control of the Secretary of Commerce.

There is also attached a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

I am advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed bill.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS W. S. DAVIS,  
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

#### STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO APPOINT SPECIAL POLICE- MEN FOR DUTY UPON CERTAIN FEDERAL PROPERTY UNDER THE CONTROL OF THE SEC- RETARY OF COMMERCE

Generally the functions pertaining to the business management of property occupied by the Department of Commerce are administered by the Administrator of General Services under the provisions of Reorganization Plan 18 of 1950. Certain property so occupied is excepted from the management of the Administrator, however, by Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950. Included in the property so excepted are certain properties occupied by the National Bureau of Standards, of the Department, and certain warehouses, shipyards and terminals occupied by the Maritime Administration, of the Department. With respect to this excepted property the Secretary of Commerce is responsible for the development and administration of the business-management functions.

Until November 1, 1949, the National Bureau of Standards, of this Department, had appointed certain of its employees as special policemen to protect the property and grounds of that Bureau. Those special policemen held commissions issued by the government of the District of Columbia. The corporation counsel of the District of Columbia, in an opinion approved on July 13, 1948, by the District Commissioners, ruled that, among others, the commissions of the special policemen at the National Bureau of Standards had been issued without proper authority, and all such commissions were canceled as of November 1, 1949. Since that time no authority has existed for the appointment of special policemen at the National Bureau of Standards. The guards at the National Bureau of Standards have not, therefore, adequate authority for the protection of persons and property on the premises of that Bureau. Since the National Bureau of Standards is making highly important contributions to the national defense, contributions which will be elaborated upon before the committees of the Congress at their request, it is vital that proper and necessary standards of conduct be established and maintained and that the buildings and grounds occupied by that Bureau be guarded and patrolled by officers having authority to enforce, by arrest and otherwise, the laws of the United States.

The Maritime Administration has certain terminals, warehouses, and shipyards, for the protection of which no special policemen are authorized at present. Although, in special circumstances, the Coast Guard would assume the task of policing these establishments, it is necessary, in the interests of national defense as well as to protect Government property, that adequate policing of these establishments be provided at all times.

It is also necessary that the Secretary of Commerce have the power to promulgate rules and regulations for the administration of the buildings, grounds, and personal property excepted from the control of the General Services Administration.

The attached proposed bill would authorize the Secretary to appoint special policemen for duty with respect to property occupied by the Department and for which he has the custodial responsibility. The bill

would also authorize the Secretary to promulgate rules and regulations for the Government of such property and to establish penalties for the violation of such rules and regulations, with the maximum penalty for each violation limited to a fine of \$50 and sentence of 30 days in jail.

In view of these facts, this Department recommends the early enactment of the proposed legislation.

#### INVESTIGATION OF SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES IN FEDERAL AGENCIES HAVING JURISDICTION IN UNITED STATES OC- CUPIED AREA IN EUROPE

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 196), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof which is making a study and investigation under the authority of S. Res. 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the internal security of the United States, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of determining the extent, nature, and effects of any espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities in Federal departments and agencies having within their jurisdiction the military or civil government, or relief, of a United States occupied area in Europe.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of such study and investigation the committee, or any such subcommittee, shall have the same powers and authorizations given to it by S. Res. 366, Eighty-first Congress, and the expenses of such study and investigation, which shall not exceed \$—, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than March 1, 1952, the results of such study and investigation together with its recommendations.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY, 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. NIXON, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. CASE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. HENDRICKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MCMAHON (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. NIXON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 4740, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4740, supra, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. MCFARLAND submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4740)



making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, the following amendment; namely, on page 65, line 14, after the word "reporting", insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That this section shall not apply to personnel work concerning employees of the Foreign Service of the United States."

Mr. McFARLAND also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4740, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Chow Hsia and her son, Sven Erik Hsia;

H. R. 711. An act for the relief of George Lukes;

H. R. 1100. An act for the relief of Eugenio Bellini;

H. R. 1102. An act for the relief of Emilio Torres;

H. R. 1128. An act for the relief of Harvey McFarland and Laurance Anthony Warnock;

H. R. 1236. An act for the relief of Rhoda Akiko Nishiyama;

H. R. 1816. An act for the relief of Shoomon Takano;

H. R. 1818. An act for the relief of Hego Fuchino;

H. R. 1825. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Simonson;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of Mrs. Beverly Brunell Roth;

H. R. 2546. An act for the relief of Charles W. Vanderhoop;

H. R. 2626. An act for the relief of Christian and Co., Inc., of Pittsburgh, Pa.;

H. R. 2669. An act for the relief of Maria Sarandrea;

H. R. 2672. An act for the relief of the law firm of Harrington and Graham;

H. R. 3128. An act for the relief of Elaine Dovico;

H. R. 3731. An act for the relief of Megumi Takagi;

H. R. 3789. An act for the relief of Roosevelt Pollard, the General Exchange Insurance Corp., and Fred Warren;

H. R. 3818. An act for the relief of Yutaka Nakaeda;

H. R. 4154. An act for the relief of the estate of Jake Jones, deceased;

H. R. 4228. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lorene M. Williams;

H. R. 4688. An act for the relief of Cecelia Wahls;

H. R. 4756. An act for the relief of George Francis Hammers;

H. R. 4931. An act for the relief of Lewyt Corp.; and

H. R. 4953. An act for the relief of Gladys J. McCarthy; to Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3898. An act for the relief of William E. Gillespie, Jr.; and

H. R. 4692. An act to authorize the appointment of Joseph F. Carroll as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4219. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Louis W. Milliken;

H. R. 4351. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Ursula Rutherford Ollinger; and

H. R. 4352. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mary Rutherford Spearson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 145) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WHERRY:

Editorial entitled "Congress: Worser and Worser," published in the Washington Star of August 21, 1951.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Editorial entitled "A Matter of Common Sense," published in the Washington Evening Star of August 13, 1951, with reference to the Government policy on industrial dispersion.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Editorial entitled "Foreclosing Science," published in the Washington Post of August 22, 1951, and letter entitled "National Science Foundation Budget," written by William T. Golden, and published in the Washington Post.

Editorials commenting on Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the first entitled "Rescuing RFC," published in the Washington Post of August 22, 1951, the second entitled "Report No. 2," published in the Dayton Daily News of August 21, 1951.

By Mr. JENNER:

Article entitled "Refugees Recall Torture Death of Colonel Lukas in Czech Prison," published in the Washington Evening Star of August 22, 1951.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorial entitled "Facts on Crime," published in the Washington Post of August 22, 1951, with reference to a proposed investigation into crime in the District of Columbia.

#### OIL AND GAS LEASING ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to a volume on "Oil and Gas Leasing on the Public Domain," recently written by Mr. Lewis E. Hoffman, Chief of the Minerals Branch of the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior.

The development of the vast mineral, oil, and gas resources of the public domain in the Western States is of vital interest to the Nation, and the success which has attended the production of natural wealth in the public-lands States throughout the years, under the supervision of the Department of the Interior, is a matter in which all Americans can take pride.

The laws and regulations governing oil and gas leasing are ably and comprehensively set forth in Mr. Hoffman's book to which I have just referred. I know Mr. Hoffman personally and am pleased to testify he is a most capable and conscientious public servant. In this volume Mr. Hoffman presents, step by step, the administrative procedures which have been developed and which an applicant must follow to obtain a permit to prospect for oil and gas on the federally owned lands of the West, and then

to obtain a lease for production. In each case, he sets forth the basic statutory law and the rules and regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior for implementation and administration of the law.

This book is a labor of love by a public official. Mr. Hoffman spent more than 1,200 hours of his own time, outside of office hours, in the painstaking research and careful writing of this book. However, all royalties received from its sale will be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Marion Clawson, the able Director of the Bureau of Land Management, has written an interesting foreword to this work, outlining the growth and development of leasing on the public land. He points out, for example, that in the 31 years since the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 was passed, approximately a billion, eight hundred million barrels of petroleum and a trillion, eight hundred billion cubic feet of gas have been produced. Rents and royalties covered into the Federal Treasury total more than \$260,000,000.

Here is a governmental activity that, far from being a drain on the taxpayer, is an outstanding financial success.

To return to Mr. Hoffman's work, it tells the reader: "What to do," "How to do it" and the "Why" so that the applicant who seeks the right to prospect; the lessee or operator who desires to drill and produce oil or gas; the holder of options on leases for public land; the purchaser of royalty interests and in fact everyone connected directly or indirectly with the oil and gas industry, will proceed each in their respective field, with more understanding and assurance. Its aim is to protect the right of the citizen under the various provisions of the leasing act and at the same time preserve the interest of the United States.

In addition to the text, it contains more than 220 pages of exhibits, consisting of 11 public laws affecting oil and gas leasing on public lands; 21 circulars, regulations, and orders issued by the Department of the Interior under such laws; 34 forms used by the Bureau of Land Management and the public in connection with the processing of papers under the leasing acts; 7 current departmental decisions interpreting various provisions of the law and regulations; a complete list of all Bureau of Land Management, United States Geological Survey, Bureau of Reclamation and Forest Service field offices, as well as a list of State offices which deal with the right to prospect and produce oil and gas from State-owned lands. In short, within the two covers of the book, the author has gathered all the information available under the laws and regulations on oil and gas leasing on the public lands.

The book is published and distributed by Frank H. Gower, 321 First National Bank Building, Denver, Colo., and sells for \$7. A wide circulation and proper use of the manual as a ready reference book by the oil and gas industry, the employees in the various governmental agencies dealing with oil and gas matters, as well as others concerned with the knowledge of the provisions of the Oil and Gas Leasing Act, will save millions



has well served the consumer." And I want it to be clearly apparent, as one of the sponsors of this bill, that not only has there been no adverse consumer action from my own State, but general approval; but also that, likewise, the processors and the growers, whether the big growers or the small independent growers, have all united in asking their delegation from the State of Florida to sponsor this act.

Mr. President, when such a well worked out system is serving in such a harmonious way, I think it is not at all difficult for us to understand that, with all forces cooperating, the passage of this act becomes a simple and a pleasant duty, subserving as it does the interest, the welfare, and the continued protection of all who are so vitally affected by this legislation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to say but a few words about this bill, particularly with reference to the statements made by the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. The statement was made by the junior Senator from Arkansas that there are only 85,000 farmers who are receiving payments under the Sugar Act.

I believe the record will show that although only 85,000 farmers may be receiving payments, enormous numbers of persons are working for those who are receiving payments. In the State of Louisiana there are approximately 8,000 persons receiving payments under the Sugar Act, but I suppose there are upward of 100,000 who work in the factories, fields, and refineries. Those industries would have to close down if there were no Sugar Act to keep them alive.

There are large investments in our sugar refineries, as well as investments in farm machinery which is adapted especially to the production of sugar. It is a recognized fact that without the benefit of the act, which has not resulted in high sugar prices, the industry could not continue to operate, and all the investments would be lost. Even with the benefit of the act, it has been argued that sugar prices have risen, to which the answer has been given, and clearly documented in comparison with the prices of all other commodities, that the price of sugar has been held on a level keel, and has even gone down, while the price of every other commodity has risen, including the costs of all items of expense in connection with the production of sugar.

I should like to point out that the sugarcane farmers in the State of Louisiana are certainly not receiving a bonanza, and the same is true of the sugar producers in the rest of the United States. During the past 2 years of the few sugar factories existing in the State of Louisiana, seven have gone into bankruptcy, which certainly does not indicate that the industry is particularly healthy. Those concerned would have liked to pay farmers more for their product, and to pay field labor more. Wages are extremely low in the industry, which would indicate that not less aid but more aid is needed for the industry.

Mr. President, I have a statement of Secretary of Commerce, Charles Saw-

yer, in connection with a visit to Louisiana and various other sections of the United States, examining into various industries and economic groups. He pointed out that the sugar industry in the State of Louisiana was particularly a distressed industry, that it involved low wage and living standards, and that the persons engaged in the growing, processing, and refining of sugarcane were in a distressed condition, which is certainly far from the picture which was painted for us by the junior Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the Secretary of Commerce to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement regarding the critical situation existing in the Louisiana sugar industry was contained in a letter Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer wrote to John R. Steelman, Assistant to the President, reporting on business conditions throughout the country. On his survey, the Secretary visited all parts of the country where he held an extended series of meetings with businessmen, labor leaders, and public officials. In appendix D, page 3, he commented as follows:

"A particularly distressing situation called to my attention in Louisiana concerned wage and living standards among workers on sugar plantations. Though the problem involves intricate regulatory activity designed to control imports and maintain domestic production, and though it is greatly complicated by the varying degrees of integration between the growing, processing, and refining functions as they are found in specific companies, there appears to be little question but that because of postwar prices set on raw sugar and the wage payments they make possible, growers and processors are not doing well and that field workers are barely getting a subsistence living. I was told that this year's crop will benefit to some extent from a price increase made by the Department of Agriculture several months ago. However, public officials and labor and religious leaders with whom I talked are extremely anxious to see that price and wage arrangements are effected which will permit growers and processors to operate solvently and provide decent wage and living standards for those who work in the fields."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Louisiana if there will be any further discussion of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I think not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Therefore, I suggest that we might ask that the bill be put to a vote at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BENTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that

further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is unavoidably detained on official committee business, and if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is unavoidably detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senators from Oregon [Mr. CORDON and Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 4, as follows:

#### YEAS—72

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Bennett       | Hill            | McClellan    |
| Bricker       | Hoey            | McFarland    |
| Butler, Md.   | Holland         | McKellar     |
| Butler, Nebr. | Hunt            | McMahon      |
| Cain          | Ives            | Millikin     |
| Carlson       | Jenner          | Moody        |
| Case          | Johnson, Colo.  | Mundt        |
| Chavez        | Johnson, Tex.   | Murray       |
| Clements      | Johnston, S. C. | Neely        |
| Connally      | Kefauver        | Nixon        |
| Dirksen       | Kerr            | O'Connor     |
| Dworshak      | Kilgore         | O'Mahoney    |
| Eaton         | Knowland        | Robertson    |
| Ellender      | Langer          | Russell      |
| Ferguson      | Lehman          | Saltonstall  |
| Flanders      | Lodge           | Schoeppel    |
| George        | Long            | Smathers     |
| Gillette      | Magnuson        | Smith, Maine |
| Green         | Malone          | Smith, N. J. |
| Hendrickson   | Martin          | Smith, N. C. |
| Hickenlooper  | McCarran        | Sparkman     |



Stennis  
Thye  
Underwood

Watkins  
Welker  
Wherry

Wiley  
Williams  
Young

# NAYS—4

Benton  
Fulbright

Kem

Pastore

# NOT VOTING—20

Aiken  
Anderson  
Brewster  
Bridges  
Byrd  
Capehart  
Cordon

Douglas  
Duff  
Eastland  
Frear  
Hayden  
Hennings  
Humphrey

Maybank  
McCarthy  
Monroney  
Morse  
Taft  
Tobey

So the bill (H. R. 4521) was passed.

## STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the order of the Senate of yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate, House bill 4740.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I knew that the order provided that this bill should be the next order of business, but did the unanimous consent agreement of yesterday include the provision that it be taken up for action today?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I understood the unanimous consent request to be that it be made the unfinished business, but I certainly made it plain that I feel that all the important appropriation bills should lie over 1 day before action is taken. I do not object to the bill being made the unfinished business, but I do not believe that the Senate has had the time within the past 24 hours, to study the bill. Of course, if no action is taken, I shall have no complaint about the unanimous consent agreement. I hope no action will be taken this afternoon. I have no objection to explanations. The bill can be debated, and if there are no controversial items, I shall have no complaint. But if there are controversial items, they should not be taken up today.

## THE WARTIME ECONOMY—ECONOMIC AID TO EUROPE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate on a subject other than the appropriation bill.

For several months I have known with misgivings that the day would come when someone in this body must make the unpleasant summary which I make today.

We have been fighting a limited war for a year, and during that year our Nation has made many large decisions. From an economy of peace we have moved to something which is pretty well along the road to total mobilization. Our people now understand that we may have to say goodbye to the era of ice boxes and automobiles and accept the era of tanks and bombers. Whatever may be the differences among us on a score of military issues—and there are at least that many—there is one area in which we are not divided. Each of us, each in his own

time, has come to the realization that the time for sacrifices has come—that the money we would like to spend for hospitals and roads and schools must go instead into gunpowder. The entire Nation understands that the future is not a reassuring picture of business as usual, but a future of losses, of surrender of income; an era when our finest grade of steel must be written off as a war expendable rather than built into tractors.

Those of us who have been trying to visualize this cost and loss have wondered where it is possible to save, what things to cut out, what Federal expenditures to curtail so that the bill might be kept down to the subastronomic level rather than allowed to soar to the astronomic.

Ever since June a year ago, when the Korean War warned us to get ready for the era of expenses at the astronomic level, we have known that sooner or later we must debate as a separate issue the cost of economic aid to the nations of Europe. We have wondered whether this is an item that could be crossed off the long list of expenditures. We have wondered whether the Marshall plan has brought recovery to Europe sufficient for Europe to achieve its own rearmament with American military help but without calls on the United States for still more economic help. I myself have speculated for months as to what position would be taken by the executive department on the subject of economic aid in this new post-Korean era. That question has been answered by the Executive message to Congress which asks that we approve five and a quarter billions as a contribution to Europe's rearmament and one and two-thirds billions for continued economic aid to supplement that rearmament. We know that these two figures represent the calculations of several hundred American officials who have been wrestling with the problem of Europe's rearmament for many months. They are submitted to us as representing their considered judgment of what is necessary on the part of the United States in order to get performance on Europe's commitments to rearm.

Mr. President, that great baffling question—whether the majority of the European NATO members will perform seriously on the armament commitments undertaken in the treaty—and the twin question, whether more United States dollars are a condition to such performance, are questions which will occupy the Congress for weeks. In view of the complexity of the subject I have been searching for a way of simplifying it. And I have found no way of simplifying it without giving over the chronology of our actions in Europe which have brought us to this moment, when in the summer of 1951 the executive department is asking for a further one and two-thirds billions for economic aid.

The question whether Europe will deliver, and the question whether we must continue economic help to insure that delivery, must be evaluated in the light of a European crisis which is at least 10 years old. There has been a crisis in Europe at least that long, and the year

1950 was the first in European memory that showed evidence of substantial recovery. The question which this Congress must decide is whether there has been a change in Europe of sufficient magnitude to produce a serious rearmament drive without further contributions of American economic aid. This inquiry requires a brief review of two crises as they existed in 1946 and 1947, the years which marked Europe's low point, and an appraisal as to whether those crises are past or whether the improvements are so transitory that economic aid must continue. This will be the area of debate. I should like, if possible, to shorten that debate by suggesting what, in my opinion, are the two alternatives from which eventually this body must choose. I suggest that after weeks of debate we will arrive at a choice between these two alternatives.

## THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. President, the decision before us cannot be separated from decisions we made in Europe in 1947. That is to say, we are being asked to pay an assessment today on a corporation whose stock we underwrote in 1947. Parenthetically, I set the year or the start of the Marshall plan as 1947, the year it was conceived, rather than 1948, the year of its congressional enactment. It was in 1947 that this country undertook one of the strangest ventures in the history. It was the national decision that 1 nation contribute billions to some 15 other nations. In 1947, and for the third time in our history, we adjudged the survival of Europe to be an American concern. The nature of the threat in those days was political, not military. We had just witnessed the disappearance of six European countries behind the iron curtain and, as of 1947, we saw evidence that several more countries were in danger of following them. The causes of the impending drift into communism were adjudged to be economic causes. The remedial measure was a concept unique in relations between countries—the wholesale financial rescue of these sinking economies so as to bring about recovery. Economic recovery would then counteract Russia's political successes. It was estimated at the time that this undertaking would require 4 years, and a contribution of United States tax money in the amount of \$17,000,000,000. As of 1947 the threat of military attack by Russia was considered a possibility, but only a potential, secondary to Russia's political infiltration, which was in full operation, and operating with great success.

## THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

This decision to wage political war, via the device of economic recovery, and via United States dollars, resulted in our sending a task force of American administrators and economists to each Marshall-plan country. It is essential to an understanding of the debate over economic aid to recall one of the first road blocks that confronted these ECA officials in 1948.

One of the first problems, in a campaign that was economic, was a military problem. Within 4 months of its arrival in Europe every ECA mission staff arrived at the simultaneous finding that











The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 192) was agreed to.

# INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 194, submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on August 20, 1951, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That in discharging the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, Eighty-first Congress, the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized to expend the sum of \$15,000 from the contingent fund of the Senate in addition to any other moneys available to the committee for such purpose. The authority contained in this resolution shall expire on January 31, 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent does the resolution increase the limit of expenditures of the Select Committee on Small Business?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution will increase the limit of expenditures by \$15,000, for the purposes of the committee, to be available between now and the 31st of January of next year.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is aware of the fact, is he not, that representatives of the committee appeared before our subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and were refused by it an amount equal to the amount given a standing committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct, but that refusal was on the principle that all committees would be in the same status.

So the Committee on Rules and Administration, faced with that matter, heard the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and thought he made a justification for the \$15,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand that today the Select Committee on Small Business has available to it as much money as any standing committee has.

Mr. HAYDEN. It has.

Mr. ELLENDER. This resolution, if agreed to, would give the Select Committee on Small Business \$15,000 in addition to the amount available to a standing committee. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 194) was agreed to.

# PAYMENT FOR PERSONAL SERVICES BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate resolution 164, submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) on June 27, 1951, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of \$841.49 for the purpose of discharging obligations for personal services incurred under authority of Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress, as extended by Senate Resolution 367, Eighty-first Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much is to be paid to the committee under the provisions of this resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount is \$841.49, to pay the compensation of a person employed by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the month of January, when the committee had no funds available. This resolution, when agreed to, will permit that amount of money to be taken out of the funds the committee now has.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In line 6, after the word "Congress", to insert a comma and "such sum to be paid from funds authorized to be expended by said committee under authority of Senate Resolution 71, agreed to February 28, 1951."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 164), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of \$841.49 for the purpose of discharging obligations for personal services incurred under authority of Senate Resolution 140, Eighty-first Congress, as extended by Senate Resolution 367, Eighty-first Congress, such sum to be paid from funds authorized to be expended by said committee under authority of Senate Resolution 71, agreed to February 28, 1951.

# ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 23, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 61. An act for the relief of Sister Carmen Teva Ramos;

S. 100. An act to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of certain aliens;

S. 289. An act for the relief of Arno Edwin Kolm;

S. 349. An act to assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense;

S. 518. An act for the relief of Dr. Isaac C. Goldstein;

S. 530. An act for the relief of Gerhard H. A. Anton Bebr;

S. 630. An act to suspend until August 15, 1951, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

S. 652. An act for the relief of Ruth Alice Crawshaw;

S. 818. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted land on the Crow Reservation, Mont.;

S. 827. An act for the relief of Fred P. Hines;

S. 930. An act for the relief of Ivan Herben, his wife, son, and daughter-in-law;

S. 1033. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lucille Ellen Sanders Groh;

S. 1034. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Julia Jackson Sanders;

S. 1036. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Julia Jackson Sanders;

S. 1220. An act to authorize the appointment of Bernt Balchen as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force;

S. 1242. An act for the relief of Salomon Henri Laifer;

S. 1474. An act for the relief of E. C. Browder and Charles Keylon;

S. 1503. An act for the relief of Harold Frederick D. Wolfgramm; and

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

# BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2042. A bill to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 2043. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain property by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2044. A bill for the relief of Paula Neumann Mahler; and

S. 2045. A bill for the relief of Alexander M. Lidorikis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 2046. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith for retirement as an emergency officer under the provisions of Emergency Officers Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 2047. A bill to continue the improvement and protection of the natural resources of the United States by providing for the transfer to the States of certain lands acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and held by such States under lease; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'CONOR when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. NIXON, and Mr. WELKER):

S. 2048. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FERGUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution designating the second Saturday in October in each year as "National Farmers' Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### TRANSFER TO STATES OF CERTAIN LANDS ACQUIRED UNDER BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the States of the Union certain lands administered under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. The bill will go a long way toward solving some of the administrative problems in the management of these Federal-owned leased lands.

At the present time these public lands are not effectively being administered and the proposed legislation would simply direct the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture to convey to the 18 States which would be affected by the bill, title to the 33 areas involved.

These properties are not now adequately cared for because both the State legislatures and the Congress itself are reluctant to appropriate funds for maintenance or new improvements since the title is not clearly held by either. This lack of adequate care, coupled with boundary disputes and trespass cases provide, in our opinion, clear indication that steps are necessary to bring about a solution to this problem.

The sponsors of this bill believe that everything possible should be done to continue to insure the improvement and protection of the natural resources of our country and we believe that providing for the transfer to the States of certain lands acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Act and now held by such States under lease, will go a long way toward furthering this objective.

The bill (S. 2047) to continue the improvement and protection of the natural resources of the United States by providing for the transfer to the States of certain lands acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and

held by such States under lease, introduced by Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY, 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4740, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. WELKER (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. JENNER, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. BRIDGES) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 4740, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MOODY (for himself and Mr. UNDERWOOD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 4740, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. BENTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4740, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GREEN (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. BENTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 4740, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. NIXON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4740, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

An address delivered by him on July 6, 1951, before the convention of National Association of County Officials, at Milwaukee, Wis.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

An address on the subject Fundamental Government, delivered by former Representative Charles A. Plumley, of Vermont, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. LANGER:

Article entitled "Pioneers in Western North Dakota Carved a Living from the Wilderness," written by Nellie B. Noyce, and published in the July 26, 1951, issue of the Hettlinger County Herald, of New England, N. Dak.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Socialism Is Not for Us," written by Ralph S. Yohe, and published in the Prairie Farmer for August 18, 1951.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "Unethical Conduct Is Still the Big Issue," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 22, 1951, with reference to the investigation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

By Mr. MALONE:

Senator MCCARTHY's reply to President Truman over the Nation-wide network of the

American Broadcasting Co., under the heading "Undercover Communist agents in government."

Joint statement entitled "The Halogeton Menace," issued by the Nevada State Farm Bureau and Nevada State Cattle Association. Article entitled, "Nevada Civil Works Status Reported," published in the Reno (Nev.) Evening Gazette of August 18, 1951.

Editorial entitled "Administration Might Follow Army Example in Handling Ethics," published in the Humboldt Star, of Winnemucca, Nev.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS FOR USE OF SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE USE OF CHEMICALS IN FOOD PRODUCTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 39, which was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C., sec. 154), as amended, the Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products (created by H. Res. 323, Eighty-first Congress) is hereby authorized to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of all hearings held before it during the Eighty-first Congress.*

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 39) was considered and agreed to.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATING TO REVENUE REVISION BY HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 146, which was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of each part of the hearings relative to revenue revision held before said committee during the current session.*

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 146) was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

#### STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of State—Salaries and expenses," on page 2, line 9, after "287r," to insert "settlement of



claims as authorized by Public Law 455, approved March 10, 1950."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Aiken         | Hickenlooper    | Moody        |
| Bennett       | Hill            | Morse        |
| Benton        | Hoey            | Mundt        |
| Bricker       | Holland         | Murray       |
| Butler, Md.   | Hunt            | Ncely        |
| Butler, Nebr. | Ives            | Nixon        |
| Byrd          | Jenner          | O'Connor     |
| Carlson       | Johnson, Colo.  | O'Mahoney    |
| Case          | Johnson, Tex.   | Pastore      |
| Chavez        | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson    |
| Clements      | Kefauver        | Russell      |
| Connally      | Kem             | Saltonstall  |
| Cordon        | Kerr            | Schoeppel    |
| Dirksen       | Knowland        | Smathers     |
| Douglas       | Langer          | Smith, Maine |
| Duff          | Lehman          | Smith, N. C. |
| Dworshak      | Lodge           | Sparkman     |
| Eaton         | Long            | Stennis      |
| Ellender      | Magnuson        | Thye         |
| Ferguson      | Malone          | Underwood    |
| Flanders      | Martin          | Watkins      |
| Frear         | Maybank         | Welker       |
| Fulbright     | McCarran        | Wiley        |
| George        | McClellan       | Williams     |
| Gillette      | McFarland       | Young        |
| Green         | McKellar        |              |
| Hayden        | McMahon         |              |
| Hendrickson   | Millikin        |              |

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of a death in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). A quorum is present. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 4, in line 1, after the word "abroad", to strike out "and."

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE OF MEMBERS OF THE JAPANESE DIET

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask the Senator from Nevada to suspend for a moment while the Chair presents some distinguished guests, four members of the Japanese Diet, who have done us the honor of visiting the Sen-

ate. They are on a visit to the United States, studying our institutions and becoming acquainted with our people, as well as giving us the benefit of their experience, in a friendly exchange of communications and associations. A number of delegations from the Japanese Diet have visited the Senate during the past few months. We have been very glad to welcome them. We hope that their association with us in their visits to this country will be mutually beneficial to the Japanese people and the American people.

Until the recent unpleasantness the relationship between the Japanese and American Governments and between the Japanese and American people was one of a long season of peace, cooperation, and understanding. We are happy in the belief that out of the recent unfortunate conflict a new era of peace between Japan and the United States will be ushered in. We are very proud of the fact that in a few weeks a treaty of peace will be signed between the Japanese Government and the Government of the United States, which will restore that status of peace. We look forward, following the signing of the treaty, to a long season of peaceful and cooperative relationship between the Japanese people and the people of the United States.

There is not now, nor has there ever been, any real fundamental reason why there should be conflict between the ambitions, political, economic, or social, of the Japanese people and the American people. Therefore, we are very glad to welcome to the Chamber men and women, representatives of the Japanese people, who are seeking in a genuine way to make some contribution to the restoration of the happy and peaceful relationships which have for so long a time existed between their country and ours.

So, it is a pleasure for me, as President of the Senate, to welcome you gentlemen, who are members of the Japanese Diet. I believe that three of you are members of the Japanese House of Representatives, and one is a member of the House of Councillors, which corresponds to our Senate.

We hope your stay here has been and will continue to be pleasant and profitable, and that you will take back with you valuable lessons for your people in the future, and that you will leave with us valuable lessons also, which will contribute to the peaceful era for which we hope and pray in the years to come.

[Applause. Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised, and is happy to report the fact, that one of the members of the delegation, Mr. Kosaka, desires to make a brief response to the welcome which we are giving them; and the Chair is happy to recognize Mr. Kosaka. He may speak from where he now stands, or he may come to the rostrum, if he wishes.

The Chair will declare a brief recess while the Japanese delegate speaks; and we shall resume the session thereafter.

Thereup (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess:

The Hon. Tentaro Kosaka, member of the Japanese House of Representatives, came to the rostrum, and delivered the following address:

ADDRESS BY HON. TENTARO KOSAKA, A MEMBER OF THE JAPANESE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. KOSAKA. Mr. President, honorable Members of the United States Senate, it is my great honor to be given this rare opportunity to speak on this honorable occasion on behalf of the delegation of the Japanese people. As the representative of the Japanese people, I can say with authority that the appreciation of the Japanese people toward the people of the United States of America is immeasurable. The great American people did not make us taste the bitter bread of defeat. Instead, you chose to give us a new life—a life of freedom and aspirations. We are endeavoring to build a Japan in which democracy is vivid in action. We Diet members are working to further enhance our new democratic life, which you have so carefully nursed in the past six years. Thanks to you, we have learned the meaning of being on the side of free nations.

Besides the ideological contribution, you have helped both economically and morally to help bring our devastated country back on its feet again. It was indeed a blessing in disguise that we were under the American occupation.

If it were not for American leadership, Japan would never have been given the peace treaty, a treaty based on reconciliation and dignity on an equal footing. Only the American Nation could conceive of giving the defeated Japanese nation such a magnanimous and generous treaty.

Although there are many obstacles in the way of our economic rehabilitation, we will make every effort to reconstruct the Japanese economy and to contribute our part toward world economy.

In conclusion, I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that the Japanese nation, in order to show its sincere appreciation for what you have done for us, is determined to make democracy stay in Japan forever, and will leave no stone unturned to live up to the expectations of the United States of America and the other free Nations.

I thank you.

[Applause, Members of the Senate and occupants of the galleries rising.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair and the Senate appreciate the very gracious remarks of Mr. Kosaka. Inasmuch as three of the members of the delegation are members of the Budget Committee of the Japanese House of Representatives, in Tokyo, and inasmuch as we now have before us an appropriation bill for the State Department, the Justice Department, and the Commerce Department, the members of the delegation are at liberty to remain in the Chamber as long as they wish, to see how we economize, here in the United States Senate, in connection with the appropriation of money for the benefit of the people. We shall be glad to have



them remain here, and they will be welcome as long as they may wish to stay.

The Chair gives to the clerk the names of the distinguished members of the delegation, who are our guests today, so their names may appear in the RECORD.

The names of the members of the delegation from the Japanese Diet are as follows:

Yosio Sakurauti, Member of the House of Councillors, Tokyo, Japan.

Tentarō Kosaka, Member of the House of Representatives and Chairman of the Budget Committee, Tokyo, Japan.

Naoji Tachibana, Member of the House of Representatives, and member of the Budget Committee, Tokyo, Japan.

Ichitarō Ide, Member of the House of Representatives, Tokyo, Japan.

At 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m. the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Vice President.

#### STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN rose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Illinois wishes to address the Senate. I yield the floor to the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

#### MORE AFFIRMATIVE PEACE EFFORT IN STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a good many years ago I addressed a letter to the then Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, of Tennessee. I became interested, as far back as 1933 and 1934, in a more affirmative peace effort in the Department of State. At that time, I thought, and I believe others shared the opinion, that it might be well to create within the Department of State a division which would address itself very affirmatively to the question of peace. As a matter of fact, the resolution which I proposed in the Seventy-third Congress was so drafted that it would give extraordinary authority to such a division, weaponed with the necessary money and instrumentalities of publicity, authorizing it to depart from any administrative policy, and to do very much as it pleased, for the purpose of effectuating in the mind of the country and carrying on what I thought was a peace crusade designed to develop a peace consciousness in the United States.

I received a very gracious and rather extended letter from that fine old gentleman, Cordell Hull, at that time, and I think I still have it in my files. It has intrigued me a great deal. He said he did not think it practical to establish a peace division within the Department of State, because such action might be misconstrued by foreign countries, who might get the idea that the State Department, in its entire performance and in its objectives, might have only one seg-

ment which was devoted to the peace effort. I think there was merit in the observations which were made by the then Secretary of State, but, as I survey the horizons of the world today, I still feel that we might have embraced, even in those early days, some instrument which could have done a better job than has since been done, so far as the country and its thinking are concerned.

I think back to it often, and I think back to it this morning, as I examine the rather distressing and disturbing headline which confronts us all over again. God forbid that we have an augmented casualty list in Korea, that fighting on even a larger scale may break out, and that young men may again have to surrender their lives upon the altar of their country, on a battlefield that is so far from home. The headline seems most pointed to me this morning, because only yesterday afternoon I was called out into the Senate reception room, where I visited for a while with a group of amputees, who are here for the purpose of expediting action upon a pending bill which would provide specially designed automobiles for those who are minus either hands or legs. One of the boys sitting in the reception room yesterday afternoon was minus both arms and legs. That is a tremendous sacrifice to make. I am sure the sacrifice was made willingly, and I have certainly been entranced by the good will, by the spirit, and by the alertness with which they carry on under such distressing circumstances and such trying hardships.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Oregon for 10 minutes, in view of the fact that he has an engagement which he must keep immediately thereafter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### INFRINGEMENT ON THE POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT PROPOSED BY H. R. 5118

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his courtesy in yielding this time to me. I speak under a slight handicap today, but I want to assure my colleagues that in the course of a month I will stand ready and willing by that time to take bets that the first major speech I make on the floor of the Senate with new dentures, I shall make without a whistle; and I will take those bets after this speech this afternoon.

I would be much less than human, Mr. President, did I not, here on the floor, express to my many colleagues my sincere and deep appreciation for the many courtesies and wishes of good will which they have extended to me since my recent accident. However, the accident has given me an opportunity to catch up on some long-needed reading and study of certain of the problems which face our country in the field of foreign relations, and I desire to take 5 or 6 minutes this afternoon to express myself, for the RECORD, in regard to the approaching debate on the military and foreign-aid bill which will soon face the Senate; because

I regard it as a measure of great significance, so far as the attitude of our country is concerned, a measure which I consider ought to be approached from a purely nonpartisan point of view, and in the consideration of which we should not overlook certain basic constitutional principles which I desire to emphasize in my brief remarks this afternoon.

The Senate of the United States will be called upon very soon to consider a bill to help friendly countries all over the world. In the interest of their security and our security, we are asked to spend a very large sum of money for military assistance and economic and technical assistance, so that they and we will be better able to meet a very grave threat to the peace of the world. The immediate aim of our foreign policy is to check the threat with which we have been confronted by aggressive Soviet imperialism.

I should like to say a word in these brief remarks today as to the manner in which, in my opinion, we ought to provide for the carrying out of this highly important foreign-aid program, because I am very much concerned that we should not make a serious constitutional mistake. The bill we have to consider is one which lumps together economic aid, military assistance, technical assistance for underdeveloped parts of the world, aid to Palestine refugees, the rehabilitation of Korea, and other projects.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. President, it has been my judgment, since the beginning of our consideration of this issue, that it has been a great mistake to draw what I submit is a very artificial line between military aid and economic aid. I think it is a great mistake to take the position that we should cut into economic aid, but that we should not, for a moment, think of cutting into military aid, as the bill is presently framed.

It happens to be the position of the junior Senator from Oregon that there should be no cuts in either military or economic aid; but the artificial line of distinction between military and military aid is, I think, a highly fallacious one, because, in the long run, the basic security of the United States in its relations with friendly foreign powers is going to depend upon the productive power of those friendly nations, and upon their economic strength.

In the interest of brevity, I shall cite but one example to show why I believe it a mistake to draw this artificial line of distinction between so-called military aid and economic aid. I fully appreciate the fact that if a war with Russia should break out in Europe within the next few months, it is of the utmost importance that we have on the Continent of Europe a maximum amount of military power with which to meet an aggressive force.

But, Mr. President, we must also plan for the long pull, and the long pull, so far as our defenses in Europe are concerned, calls for the building up of the economic and productive power of the free nations of Europe. I happen to be one of those who believe that it is probably true that the money we spend for economic aid in Europe in the year or two immediately ahead will be money which will be more



the other nations to those contracts; so we have become intertwined in an international relationship which in my judgment is illegal, but which prevents the taking of the economic action which would bring any results, insofar as Czechoslovakia is concerned in this case?

Mr. O'CONOR. Of course, I realize that the question the able Senator has asked takes in a number of subjects.

Mr. BRICKER. Yes, it includes many things which are entirely true.

Mr. O'CONOR. His question includes certain matters which are not entirely comprehended within the resolution. However, I agree with the Senator in respect to his point that such arrangements tie our own hands, so that when matters of this kind develop, which are definitely and distinctly affronts to the dignity and prestige of our country, we are unable, because of that situation, to take action of the kind I have just indicated, which is the only type of action such countries will understand.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Does the Senator from Maryland further agree with the Senator from Ohio to the effect that this country ought to be careful about entering into any international arrangement, such as the trade relationships which now exist, which might prevent our doing everything possible to protect the rights and liberties of American citizens, as guaranteed under the Bill of Rights?

Mr. O'CONOR. I certainly feel as does the Senator from Ohio, in the light of the experience which has been ours in the recent past, of which the Oatis case is but one incident. If it stood alone there might be some extraneous questions, but, in the light of all the incidents, I think the Senator's point is well taken.

Mr. BRICKER. This case pinpoints the danger of these fuzzy international arrangements, which do not have the ratification of the Senate or the approval of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, and as part of the questioning between the Senator from Maryland and myself, that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Chicago Herald-American of Friday, August 17, 1951, entitled "Internationalism's Dangers to Freedom."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### INTERNATIONALISM'S DANGERS TO FREEDOM

Increasingly apparent becomes this country's loss of independence—its independence of action—brought about by New Deal internationalism.

The Charter and Covenants of the United Nations greatly infringe upon our national freedom.

This is so because these instruments are ratified by Congress as treaties, and as such are by judicial interpretations the supreme law of the land.

We have already had State legislation nullified by this indirect method.

The North Atlantic Alliance furnishes another example.

Any defensive measures which we undertake in Western Europe must strategically include the Mediterranean.

And for Mediterranean security Spain, Greece, and Turkey are indispensable.

But our European partners have greatly delayed proper action.

Only lately has Great Britain agreed to accept Greece and Turkey.

And Great Britain still objects to Spain, compelling us to seek a separate bilateral arrangement with that stanchly non-Communist nation.

Now another instance of our self-entrapment appears in our commercial relations with Czechoslovakia.

Since its early years the New Deal has been destroying the American protective tariff by international compacts, recently subject to a general agreement on tariffs and trade, to which 30 governments adhere.

One of the foreign countries to which we bound ourselves is Czechoslovakia.

On July 31 the State Department formally denounced Czechoslovakia for "manifestations of ill-will toward the United States" and declared an intention of terminating economic relations with the Communists at Prague.

Then it was disclosed that we could not take protective action without the consent of the other countries which are parties to the general agreement; and such assent, even if granted, may not be obtainable for months.

To be sure, it is desirable to encourage international trade and to promote world peace.

But in the effort to do so is it essential or even desirable to lose our sovereignty and independence in the pursuit of a visionary world governmentalism?

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in conclusion, all I desire to say is that I think it futile to accept such aggression supinely, because of the fact that forthright measures on our part would make it possible for the Communist propaganda machine to air some of our national failings before the world. We have maintained an abject attitude long enough, and certainly our Communist adversaries have capitalized upon it to the fullest extent.

Mr. President, I take my seat merely expressing the hope that the Secretary of State will see fit, before 4 o'clock this afternoon, to refuse to see the Czechoslovakian representative; and, if the Secretary of State fails in his duty, I say that the President of the United States, when this representative of an outlaw government comes to the White House, or before he comes, ought to tell him that he will cool his heels just as long as the American Ambassador in Czechoslovakia is being compelled to wait to see a decent, upstanding American citizen, who is today in prison merely because he is an American citizen.

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to say to the Senator, in the sincerest language at my command, that I convey to him my cordial and earnest thanks, and the thanks of Tennesseans, for the words he spoke a while ago about Cordell Hull. I served in the House of Representatives with Cordell Hull. I served in the Sen-

ate with him. He became one of the greatest Secretaries of State I have ever known. As Secretary of State, he was a firm believer in the Constitution of the United States. He did not follow "isms." He stood for the United States, and for everything for which the United States has stood throughout its history.

Cordell Hull is a wonderfully fine man, and I know he will read with the greatest of pleasure what the distinguished Senator from Illinois said about him a few moments ago. Again, in the name of Tennessee and her people, and with all my heart and with all the sincerity I possess, I thank the Senator from Illinois for his gracious and splendid words about one of the greatest men Tennessee has ever produced, and, for that matter, one of the greatest men even the United States has ever produced.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under the rule, I think I have the floor at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Illinois yielded, under a unanimous-consent agreement, for the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 140.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to speak on that resolution?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. I seek recognition for a moment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. What is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. House Concurrent Resolution 140 is before the Senate, having been taken up by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCARRAN. It temporarily displaced the appropriation bill, did it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I simply wanted to add to the rather interesting discussion which has taken place this afternoon regarding the Oatis case, that anyone who knows Czech people and is familiar with their character and their robustness, knows that they are good, God-fearing people, and that the difficulty in Czechoslovakia today is simply the result of infiltration by the insidious and bestial force which has endeavored to misdirect the entire destiny of the world.

Now we go back to that point, because, after all, it is a calculated business, as a matter of fact, and they affront us with impunity; they insult the greatest country on the face of the earth; and I think it is time for the United States of America, which has so generously poured out her resources to people in all the corners of the world, to stand up and assert its cause, and to assert the rights of its citizens everywhere in the world.

I simply want to add that, as I think of this Soviet force, this Communist force which is at work in Czechoslovakia, as elsewhere, what an astonishing thing



It is that the Tass Agency can send its representatives to sit in the Senate galleries. In the Congressional Directory, on page 566, we are very meticulous to list the Tass Telegraph Agency of the U. S. S. R., so that Mikhail Fedorov can come into the Senate to listen to anything we say, and can go into any committee session of either the House or Senate. The same is true of Laurence Todd. The same is true of Jean Montgomery, and the same thing is true of Euphemia K. Virden, all of whom are officially listed in the Congressional Directory as representing Tass Telegraph Agency of U. S. S. R. They send back anything they want. On the other hand, when in a Soviet country an American reporter undertakes by word or pen to send something to this country, he is clapped into jail, tried under false and sham charges, humiliated and outraged, and his rights are despoiled. I think that the Senate of the United States ought to go on record, through the resolution which is before the Senate this afternoon; and so I respectfully suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why not have merely a voice vote, which would not take much time? If there is a quorum call, followed by a yeas-and-nays vote, it would require much more time of the Senate, and would further delay its consideration of an important appropriation bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If we can have a yeas-and-nays vote, I am willing to dispense with the quorum call.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said:

Mr. President, in the course of my very brief observations on House Concurrent Resolution 140 relating to the arrest and conviction of William N. Oatis by sheer mistake I very unfortunately included the name of a very charming and estimable lady. I had no intention of including her in the list of those representing the Tass Agency. I know she is a very estimable person, who merits the esteem and confidence of her associates in the Press Gallery and also of the Members of this body. I apologize to her for having included her in the list, and I ask that her name be deleted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The Chair understands the name has already been deleted.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 140. On this question the yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator

from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of a death in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 0, as follows:

#### YEAS—81

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Aiken         | Hendrickson     | McMahon      |
| Bennett       | Hickenlooper    | Millikin     |
| Benton        | Hill            | Moody        |
| Bricker       | Hoey            | Morse        |
| Butler, Md.   | Holland         | Mundt        |
| Butler, Nebr. | Hunt            | Murray       |
| Byrd          | Ives            | Neely        |
| Carlson       | Jenner          | Nixon        |
| Case          | Johnson, Colo.  | O'Connor     |
| Chavez        | Johnson, Tex.   | O'Mahoney    |
| Clements      | Johnston, S. C. | Pastore      |
| Connally      | Kefauver        | Robertson    |
| Cordon        | Kerr            | Russell      |
| Dirksen       | Knowland        | Saltonstall  |
| Douglas       | Langer          | Schoeppel    |
| Duff          | Lehman          | Smathers     |
| Dworshak      | Lodge           | Smith, Maine |
| Eaton         | Long            | Smith, N. C. |
| Ellender      | Magnuson        | Sparkman     |
| Ferguson      | Malone          | Stennis      |
| Flanders      | Martin          | Thye         |
| Frear         | Maybank         | Underwood    |
| Fulbright     | McCarran        | Watkins      |
| George        | McClellan       | Welker       |
| Gillette      | McFarland       | Wiley        |
| Green         | McKellar        | Williams     |
| Hayden        |                 | Young        |

#### NAYS—0

#### NOT VOTING—15

|          |          |              |
|----------|----------|--------------|
| Anderson | Eastland | Monroney     |
| Brewster | Henning  | Smith, N. J. |
| Bridges  | Humphrey | Taft         |
| Cain     | Kilgore  | Tobey        |
| Capehart | McCarthy | Wherry       |

So House Concurrent Resolution 140 was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the preamble is agreed to.

#### STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, about 1 hour and 30 minutes ago the Senator from Illinois started to make a speech. He has not quite finished it and has not been able to resume because of all the intervening business which has taken place. However, I think my remarks can wait until after a while, so I now yield the floor in order that the Senator from Nevada may undertake some progress with the committee amendments to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, we have now returned to the consideration of House bill 4740. Before the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the committee amendments, I should like to explain briefly what the committee did in applying the Ferguson amendment to the bill.

In considering the appropriation requests, the committee has kept uppermost before it the terrible dangers facing this country at home and abroad. Abroad are the enemies of our system of government and our way of life, and at home we face the horrors of inflation which, unless checked, will bring about a downfall just as it might come from a foreign enemy. The American people are being called upon to bear a crushing tax burden, and the least they can expect in return is that every dollar expended by the Government will be expended efficiently and only for those activities which are absolutely essential.

The subcommittee has held exhaustive hearings on every item in the bill. The printed record of these hearings comprise some 2,300 pages. I wish especially to point out that the subcommittee did not receive the House bill until July 27. The hearings were begun long before the House had passed the bill. Had it not been for the fact that we commenced our hearings long before the House had acted, we would probably be here for months to come.

From the table on page 2 of the committee report it will be noted that the recommendations of the committee are 18.70 percent under the budget estimates and 2.20 percent under the total allowed by the House. For the Department of State, the recommendation is 27.42 percent under the budget and 9.04 percent under the House figure. For the Department of Justice the recommendation is the same as what was allowed by the House with the exception of the limitation on administration expenses for the Office of the Alien Property Custodian.

The recommendation for the Department of Justice is 1.51 percent under the budget. For the Department of Commerce the recommendation is 20.19 per-



cent under the budget, and 0.40 percent under the House. For the Judiciary the recommendation is 0.07 percent over the House and 2.08 percent under the budget. Dollarwise the bill recommended is \$235,413,878 under the budget, and \$23,057,852 under the House.

The recommendations of the committee are based on the Ferguson amendment. You will note that every item of appropriation carries a personnel limitation, regardless of whether the budget estimate was allowed or not. In those cases where the reduction is 10 percent or more, the personnel limitation reflects a 10-percent personnel reduction. In those cases where the budget estimate has been allowed, or where there has been a minor reduction, the personnel limitation reflects the full budget amount for personal services.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that that is the regular order at the present time.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, line 1. The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 4, after the word "advance", to insert "and (7) not to exceed \$200,000 for maintenance and operation of commissary and mess services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 6, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$73,000,000" and insert "\$74,487,777"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "of which not to exceed \$56,079,253 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 6, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "\$74,487,777" and insert in lieu thereof "\$70,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I congratulate the subcommittee and the committee as a whole for the very conscientious and difficult work which they have done in connection with this appropriation bill. I have before me the printed hearings, which consist of two volumes. It is obvious that members of the committee spent a great amount of time and worked with great diligence to save money for the taxpayer and yet preserve the integrity of the services of the United States. I, therefore, wish to begin by complimenting the committee. However, I am urging a further cut of nearly \$5,000,000 in the appropriations for the State Department, and I should like to give the reasons for it.

In 1942 there were 6,476 employees in the State Department. Last year there were 22,978. The original budget submitted by the State Department called for 27,907 employees. I congratulate the committee on reducing, in general, the budget estimates which were made, but

I should like to point out, if I may, that here we have a department which is probably more swollen in its personnel than any other department in the public service.

One of the chief criticisms which I should like to make of the State Department is that it is top-heavy with personnel. When the State Department deals with a problem, it commonly feels that the best way of handling it is to hire a large number of persons to deal with the issue. The Department then provides what may be called defense in depth, or defense in numbers. If we examine the various staffs, country by country, and section by section, I think we are forced to the conclusion that the staffs are greatly swollen and excessive in number.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has put us all in his debt by the 10-percent cut which he has succeeded in getting Congress to make in personnel. I have felt that that was not the best way of cutting. In certain departments the cut should be less than 10 percent, and in other departments the cut should be more than 10 percent. It so happens that the State Department is a case in which, in my judgment, the cut should be more than 10 percent.

I think it will be found that if 3 men are needed to do a certain job, the State Department will employ from 12 to 15. They spend a large part of their time communicating with one another. The man at the bottom will write memoranda which will be passed up through the subchiefs to the chiefs. Then there will be memoranda passed down. So when we multiply the staff we increase the amount of internal work which is needed almost in geometrical proportion, until finally the chief work of the State Department consists in its members talking to one another.

Whatever else the State Department may suffer from, it certainly suffers from administrative elephantiasis. Its limbs and organs have swollen beyond all relationship to the actual need. If we are going to cure elephantiasis on the part of the State Department, it should be done by a very rigorous operation. I suggest also a rigorous diet for the State Department.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the trunk still normal?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much for his question. However, it is not merely a case of the trunk of the elephant being swollen. The body of the State Department is swollen. So I think we could save \$5,000,000 more with profit—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Allow me to finish the thought. I think we could save \$5,000,000 more with profit, and there would be fewer State Department people to talk with one another. A larger proportion of their efforts could be used in dealing with foreign countries. So I submit we could actually greatly increase

the efficiency of the State Department by diminishing the number of State Department employees.

Mr. President, I do not wish to speak at too great length, nor shall I make any attacks upon anyone, but this seems to me to be an economy which we could make with profit, without crippling the Foreign Service of the United States.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I regret very much having to disagree with my good friend the senior Senator from Illinois, for whom I have such great personal affection and such warm regard.

I am the chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations in charge of the organization of the State Department. It was not a position which I sought, but one which I accepted—and I hope gracefully—when the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] assigned me to it.

In that capacity I have been necessarily forced to be in close contact with the personnel policies of the Department, and I have given this subject considerable study.

I do not believe that in all the Government of the United States there will be found more offices occupied night after night than in the Department of State. I know personally many of those engaged in the work of the Department, and I am sure that other Members of the Senate know many of them. They are devoted to their work, which, I may say, has grown tremendously since 1942, as the United States has taken its place as the first nation in the family of nations.

I have requested my clerk to bring from my office—and I hope he will be here very shortly—a list of the additional activities which the State Department is now charged with undertaking and discharging, and which have been added by Congress since 1942. Recently, as a member of one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I made a very hasty but intensive tour of Western Europe and the Balkans. I believe all of us on the subcommittee were impressed, I know that I was, with the devotion to duty, the intelligence, and the hard work of our State Department staffs abroad.

The Senator from Illinois has not specified exactly which division he considers to be overstaffed, which activity should be curtailed, or which country is particularly overpopulated with State Department employees. I wish that he had done so, rather than to apply a general \$5,000,000 cut.

I hope I am not disrespectful to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations when I say that they gave the State Department a very hard-boiled hearing. I believe that if the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who is in charge of the bill, had found it possible to take another \$5,000,000 out of the State Department's personnel funds, he would have done so.

So, Mr. President, it is with a great deal of regret that I must rise in opposition to the suggestion made by the



Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The picture which has been created in the minds of many people in this country, of men who are dressed in striped trousers and cutaway coats, and equipped with a cup of tea and some cookies, to say nothing of some other and even worse caricatures, has been a very poor reward for men and women who have been as devoted to their country as any men or women who serve the Government of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. They have suffered disease. They have been killed in the line of duty. They have lived in God-forsaken parts of the world in which none of us would want to live. They are our first line of defense. If they fail completely and finally, we will have a test of arms. I should like to see them treated by some of our colleagues with more consideration, in the light of the kind of work they have done and have sought to do.

I shall yield in a moment to the Senator from Illinois. First, I should like to say that included in the budget today is the wartime information program, which accounts for 50 percent of the State Department's employees who have been added. I hope to have the privilege of saying something more about the program when that item is reached in the appropriation bill. They are now charged with the administration of point 4, so-called, which is bringing technical knowledge and know-how for the improvement of health and living standards to the backward nations of the world.

I may say to the Senate that the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly, decided only 2 days ago to leave that program in the State Department, because we were convinced that fine and excellent work was being done in this activity in which some of us so deeply believe. There has been added to their duties the work connected with the United Nations and other international organizations. They have been charged with the administration of the occupation of Germany. They have had added a division entitled "Security and Investigation." Of course, the conditions in Korea have caused a great addition to their work. Finally, they have administered the Greek-Turkish program.

So, Mr. President, a casual reference to the State Department's operations as having expanded since 1942, without taking into account the additional burdens which have been placed on the Department by the Congress, to my mind is to disregard a basic and elementary situation and the fundamental facts involved.

I yield to my friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, first I may say that I appreciate the spirit in which the Senator from Connecticut speaks. It is characteristic of his general bearing and deportment in the Senate. I wish to assure the Senator from Connecticut that I was not making any attack on the personal character of the

members of the State Department. I merely stated that I thought there was an excessive number of people in the State Department.

Mr. McMAHON. If I may interrupt the Senator from Illinois, I should like to have the Record clear that I did not for a moment, knowing the Senator from Illinois as I do, insinuate or imply that the Senator from Illinois had any criticism of that kind in his mind. I thought it worth while to point out to the Senate and to the country that there are men and women working 16 and 18 hours a day all over the earth in the interests of the United States of America.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. I should like to point out that the increase in personnel of the State Department has not been entirely confined to the informational and educational activities of the Department. While these have increased greatly, nevertheless, the number of persons within the old functions of the Department of State have increased from 6,142, in 1942, to 13,773, in 1951, or more than double.

Whatever the proper criticism of the State Department might be, it is certainly true that it has grown up in a very leisurely tradition. In the past the members of the foreign service were recruited from the so-called Ivy League—Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. Before that, they had to attend St. Mark's, St. Paul's, or Groton. After graduation from an Ivy League college, they must have become members of the Metropolitan Club in Washington, or the Racquet and Tennis Club in New York. We hence created a "new internationale" of party-goers, so to speak, who formerly dominated the Department of State. In recent times the hold on the Department of this group may have lessened, but on the whole they have lived on in a very leisurely tradition.

Mr. President, it has been said of the British foreign service that they are like the fountains in Trafalgar Square, which play from 10 to 2. I do not say that we have had quite such a leisurely tradition, but on the whole it has been a very leisurely affair, which has been out of touch with the great democratic sentiments of the people of the country, who earn their living by the sweat of their brow. The Department has gone on the theory that they can solve any problem by hiring a large number of people to deal with it, until they are tiered up platoon deep, company deep, and battalion deep. As I have said, they spend a very large portion of their time writing memoranda to each other. If we decrease the total number of employees we will have more foreign relations and fewer internal communications.

The men in the Department may be very estimable gentlemen. I simply say that there are too many of them.

Mr. McMAHON. As an alumnus of one of the institutions to which the Senator has referred, namely, Yale University, I shall have to take exception, in a good-natured way, to the accusation that if one graduates from such a school he per se becomes some kind of loafer.

I do not deny that in the leisurely twenties and early thirties, when foreign relations and foreign affairs did not occupy the preeminent position they occupy today, undoubtedly there grew up a rather leisurely approach. However, I am trying to say to the Senator from Illinois that the entire tempo of the situation has changed.

In answer to the Senator's suggestion that our State Department operates in the way that the British Foreign Office was operating at the time when the fountains in Trafalgar Square played from 10 a. m. until 2 p. m., let me say that if the Senator were to pass the State Department—perhaps this evening would not be a good time; tonight the lights of the State Department might be turned on late, just to prove the point—but if the Senator will drive past the State Department with me a week from now, let us say, when perhaps those in the State Department will have forgotten the historic speech the Senator has made, we might find that the fountains in Trafalgar Square would have to play from 10 p. m. until 2 a. m. in order to accompany the working hours of the gentlemen in our State Department who are charged with such very serious responsibilities.

Let me say to the Senator and to the Senate that unless we stop traducing the men and women who serve this country—and I do not say the Senator from Illinois has traduced them, but I am addressing myself to the general situation; he has a specific point to make against a specific department, whereas I am discussing the general business of the terrific criticism of the men and women who work for the United States Government—in the end we shall destroy our democracy, because if we are going to attach a badge of opprobrium to a person because he is serving the Government of the United States, we shall end by attracting only thieves and loafers.

Again, Mr. President, I say—and I reiterate that I do not say it in relation to the remarks which have been made by my very good friend, the Senator from Illinois, for whom I have the very highest regard; and that is not said in the way in which it is sometimes said in this body—I say that this Department has had a going over by a committee which perhaps was not 100 percent sympathetic with the aims and aspirations and work of the Department. I think the Department of State probably has had, to say the least, severe judgment already passed upon it, judgment which would be made unduly severe by the adoption of the suggestion which has been made by my friend the Senator from Illinois.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1951—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 61)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the



from the disaster of higher and higher prices. It is consumers—housewives, old people, children, pensioned veterans—that we should keep uppermost in our minds when we write price-control laws. We can and should be fair to those who produce, but they are naturally in a strong position in a period of inflation. It is the millions and millions of families living on fixed and limited incomes who need protection most. They are the ones who suffer most when prices go up and up and up.

I hope the Congress will act decisively, and with these considerations in mind, to meet the inflationary danger that faces our Nation.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, August 23, 1951.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. BENTON obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me for a moment in order that I may suggest a unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. BENTON. I shall be very happy to yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wonder if we could not have a unanimous-consent agreement that the bill may be read through for committee amendments which are noncontroversial. I think we would make headway in that way. We could then return to the controversial items, such as the one which is now before the Senate in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I make that as a suggestion. If there is any objection to it, we shall have to proceed in the other way. I suppose the Senator from Connecticut wishes to address himself to this subject or to some other subject, and that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] wishes to address himself to whatever subject he may have in mind. When those addresses have been made, I wonder if we might have a unanimous-consent agreement to read the bill through for committee amendments.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Nevada wants the bill read through at this time?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; after the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Nebraska have unburdened themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, the verb just used by the Senator from Nevada, "unburden," is not too inappropriate to the remarks which I am about to make. I must say I feel a compulsion to unburden myself on the remarks of a few

moments ago of my old friend, indeed my oldest friend in the Senate, the senior Senator from Illinois. I had no thought of making them until I listened to his views about the members of the Foreign Service of the United States.

One reason I feel immediately compelled to make these comments, Mr. President, is that, so far as I know, I am the only honorary member of the Foreign Service of the United States outside the State Department. There were three of us, the last time I inquired, but the other two are old-time employees of the State Department. One has been in the Division of Foreign Service Personnel for 20 years or more; and the other is responsible for getting the men and their families and belongings in and out of port and the customs.

I achieved this unique distinction, I believe, because of my interest as Assistant Secretary of State in the passage of an act of Congress which became known as the Foreign Service Act of 1946. My concern about the organization of the State Department and the operation of the Foreign Service was so great at that time that I devoted intermittently weeks and weeks of time to studying the problems of our Foreign Service officers. I worked closely and again and again, through much disagreement and conflict, in the drawing up of the act. Indeed, Mr. President, I was the only Presidential appointee in the State Department who testified before Congress in behalf of the act. It was my opinion that it was very possibly my efforts, through Secretary Byrnes, and his telephone calls, which I urged upon him, to his friends on Capitol Hill, which accounted for the passage of the act. I recall that Assistant Secretary Braden joined me in urging this sponsorship upon the Secretary, and surely at that time there were few men who enjoyed more respect and affection on the "Hill" than Secretary Byrnes.

I feel the Senator from Illinois has expressed today ideas which must have originated with him a great many years ago, and which may even reflect his Chicago background. I suggest it is even possible that as a young man he was unconsciously influenced by the outspoken views of the Chicago Tribune. And it is widely believed that there was a time in the Foreign Service when there was an entrenched clique of wealthy men who felt that the Foreign Service should be largely confined to the graduates of Yale, Harvard, and Princeton, and furthermore, only for those graduates who were the sons of wealthy parents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has that idea disappeared from the Foreign Service?

Mr. BENTON. Yes, it has wholly disappeared.

Some decades ago I was informed when I was trying to learn the background while I was in the State Department—some years ago probably before the Rogers Act of 1924, I believe—it was charged that there were those in this clique of wealthy men who actually con-

spired to hold salaries down for Foreign Service officers, as for so many years they were deliberately held down for members of Parliament in England, so that only those with independent wealth could successfully hope to pursue the career of a Foreign Service officer, and to aspire to the most desirable posts.

The attitudes of some decades back about our Foreign Service officers, for which I concede there was some basis in fact, have become fixed in the minds of many Americans. These attitudes are what the propagandists would term "stereotypes," namely, fixed ideas which pervade the minds of some persons and which are so firmly lodged, and so easy and plausible to adhere to, that they are not readily changed. Facts change and conditions change, but the stereotype, the fixed idea, remains the same.

Mr. President, I doubt if as many as 10 percent of the 1,300 Foreign Service officers today are graduates of Yale, Harvard, and Princeton. They come from every college in the country and from every State in the Union. I would be surprised if as many as 15 percent are in receipt of independent incomes of as much as \$2,500 a year. Further, very few of them marry rich girls. I used to sit on the so-called Board of Foreign Service, to which Foreign Service officers had to appeal for permission to marry foreign citizens. Some of the letters received are very sad, indeed pathetic and tragic. These young men are stationed abroad during their most marriageable years, as thereafter, and if they do not have the chance to meet American girls they will fall in love with girls of foreign parentage. Then they have to seek permission from the State Department before they can marry. There are many tragedies in this area hidden deep within the State Department files, and many a broken life of a young man who has married unwisely, or failed to marry, growing out of the hazards and uncertainties of life abroad.

Mr. President, as to the comment of the Senator from Illinois comparing the Foreign Service officers to the fountains of London which works only from 10 until 2, I remind my colleagues that there is a rule in the State Department, as in other Government departments, calling for an 8-hour day. I can of course only speak with first-hand knowledge of the Foreign Service officers with whom I worked closely here in Washington in the Department. I will say for them that the 8-hour-day rule is violated every day. It is breeched by overwork and not by underwork. In periods of stress and crisis, these men are unrewarded for their long labors on behalf of the people of the United States.

Their 8-hour day is violated because it is so often followed by an 8-hour night. Many of the top men in the State Department, week in and week out, will average 60 or 70 hours a week, or even more. I have never known harder working men, and often without facilities which would be regarded as essential in private industry.

Mr. President, I should like for a moment to point up some of the hazards and risks these men face in their careers.



It is these which, in my opinion, make them the most unappreciated group of public servants anywhere in the Federal Government or anywhere in this country. They start in work overseas as very young men. Frequently they have to live abroad for 10 or 15 years before they have any real opportunity to return and be reexposed to their own country. In the act of 1946, for the first time in American history, we provided that Foreign Service officers should spend 3 years in the United States out of their first 15 years in the Service. I am told it has often proved impossible to live up to this highly desirable provision. During their periods of service these men serve terms on the Gold Coast, in Managua, in the Belgian Congo, and in many other parts of the world these men serve terms where they run grave risks of permanent injury of their health. Frequently they are separated from their families. In many cases they cannot take their wives along, as is true today in Hong Kong and in Korea. In changing from post to post, from one part of the world to another, they have no chance to build a home, achieve stability, develop friends and associates in a community, become a member of community organizations, participate in community activities, and put their roots down. No wonder some of them occasionally develop neuroses.

Mr. President, theirs is dangerous work, dangerous mentally as well as physically. To how great a danger has the young Foreign Service officer just expelled from Hungary been exposed? He is the son of my old friend Albert W. Sherer, a fellow trustee of the University of Chicago, of which the Senator from Illinois was such a distinguished ornament for so many years. He married the beautiful daughter of another trustee, the late Paul Russell, one of my warmest friends. He and his children are lucky to be out of Hungary alive.

At a legation level, frequently our Foreign Service officers do not even have a chance to develop a satisfactory wardrobe. Just as they get their wardrobe adjusted to Sweden, they may be shifted and sent to New Delhi.

Mr. President, of special note is the fact that the conditions under which they live present a very grave and difficult problem in the rearing of their children. Our Foreign Service officers are frequently assigned to districts where there are no suitable schools. The children often have to be sent home for education, and often a Foreign Service officer does not have financial resources which make it possible for him to have his children properly taken care of in one part of the world and to maintain himself and his wife in another. It was this problem, of such appeal to anyone of us, that caused me 6 years ago to offer \$1,000 for scholarships, a gift I have renewed each year since. I think it would be more suitable for us today to be debating a bill to provide scholarships for children of Foreign Service officers—and other things to which they are entitled which they have never been given—than to a debate a cut in funds al-

ready too meager. The attitudes of the kind expressed by the Senator from Illinois keep the Congress alert to cut the budget down. Unhappily, over a period of years, there has been all too little leadership in the presentation of the case to the Congress. I blame this lack of leadership and lack of courage in presenting the case far more than I do the Congress.

Mr. President, I have touched very briefly on a few of the occupational hazards of the Foreign Service officers, and these will explain why I have tried to correct, the understanding of my very good friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The Foreign Service as it exists today is a very different Foreign Service from that of his caricature.

I shall conclude by referring to one unhappy facet of our foreign-service operation which should be of concern today to the Congress and to all the American people. This is the fear which develops in these men of treatment to which they may be subjected. Frequently the most able of them, who have most fearlessly expressed their opinions and stood up and fought for what they believed to be right, have failed to receive the promotion, possibly because they have served under some ambassador with whom they did not successfully get along. Sometimes a man far less able and competent will receive the high recommendation of the ambassador or some other superior officer and will secure the promotion. Often these men serve under men, sometimes only very temporary officials, who bring prejudice to bear in their relations with the professional career men.

As a result of this fear, which is most natural, and of the injustices from which they often suffer, the bad treatment they often receive, the poor pay they get through most years of their lives, as a group I feel they have developed what I once called a mass inferiority complex. Of course, it is this defensive reaction which causes them to cling together, to seem to become clannish, or to give a cliquish impression to some of those with whom they come in touch. Many of them believe that President Roosevelt disliked the Service and was prejudiced against them.

Of course, Mr. President, this timidity or fear or apprehension, which keeps men from speaking out, and which would color their reports or their relations with their superiors, is being accelerated by the kind of charges which are being leveled against many of them, such as the charges Ambassador Hurley made when he came back from China, and far more manifestly, the many charges with which we are familiar, leveled by one of our colleagues on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for showing me the courtesy of permitting me to precede him.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I appeal to the Senator from Illinois. He sees now the turmoil he created by the use of one expression. If the Senator from Illinois had not used the term "fig leaf," or what was it?—"maple leaf," whichever one it was, we would not have had this loss of time in the consideration

of the bill. If the Senator from Illinois will be a little more careful in his use of figures of speech, I think we will get along a little faster.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall seek to be careful.

#### BUREAUCRACY UNLIMITED

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate for a few minutes on a question other than the bill which is now under consideration.

Only 6 years ago, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate held hearings on S. 555, a bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority. On October 18, 1945, the committee submitted an adverse report on the bill, which was the report of its subcommittee, who were John H. Overton, chairman of the subcommittee; Joseph C. O'Mahoney; Chan Gurney; Hugh Butler.

The transcript of the hearings covers 700 pages. The hearings were complete. No one was denied the opportunity to appear for or against the bill. I do not wish to describe now the provisions of the bill, S. 555, nor shall I take time to discuss the issues involved. I shall read for the record, however, the 12 conclusions of the report of the committee as background for what I have to say. These conclusions are:

(a) A comprehensive plan for the development of the resources of the Missouri River Basin has, after thorough consideration by the Congress, been adopted, and the initial stages thereof have been authorized for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. This plan provides a program of unified water and land resource development and control for the Missouri River Basin.

(b) Execution of the plan already approved by the Congress through existing Federal agencies, in cooperation with the States, assures proper emphasis on the primary needs of flood control and irrigation, and resolves conflicts between the uses of water. It assures, furthermore, that the plan will be carried out by experienced agencies.

(c) The existing laws and procedures provide for full integration of the activities of the established Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of prosecuting the several phases of water- and land-resource development. These policies and procedures protect States' rights and interests, State water law, and provide full cooperation between the local, State, and Federal interests.

(d) The present organization of the Bureau of Reclamation affords the benefits of resource development on a regional basis without the objectionable features contained in S. 555.

(e) Under S. 555, policies and laws respecting the use and control of water, heretofore established by the Congress, are in a large measure destroyed, and the State water laws and States' rights and interests in water and its utilization and control are not adequately preserved and protected. Provisions of S. 555, ostensibly designed for this purpose, are wholly inadequate.

(f) The Corps of Engineers of the United States Army and the Bureau of Reclamation would either be eliminated entirely from the Missouri Basin, or their activity curtailed at the will of the Authority. Other Federal land and water agencies operating in that basin would find it necessary in large measure to conform with the policies of the Authority. The laws under which these agencies now operate and basic provisions of the present reclamation law would, so far as the Missouri Basin is con-



We will cooperate in the management of the works when the time comes, as States, not as pleading petitioners for favors at the feet of the Authority. It is actually silly to take seriously the perennial platitudes of the Authority planners when they intimate that the operation of this reservoir system is so complicated that only an Authority could understand and undertake it. The method is devised to provide maximum use of the river. That means to secure from the river the maximum power production, water supply, flood-damage prevention, and the best downstream river control. I think the benefits would come

in that order with the recognition that feasible irrigation improvements upstream shall never be denied development under the plans. The operations are probably less difficult in the tributary basin in Nebraska and Kansas. There are no superproblems which necessitate a superstate for the Missouri River Basin.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a table of appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Annual appropriations,<sup>1</sup> summary by funds and total expenditures, 1902-51

| Fiscal year       | Reclamation fund       | General fund <sup>2</sup> | Revenue available | Emergency funds | Permanent appropriation expenditures | Total funds available for expenditure | Total expenditures        |
|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1906 <sup>3</sup> | \$17,363,800           |                           |                   |                 |                                      | \$17,363,800                          | <sup>4</sup> \$12,658,163 |
| 1907              | 18,051,161             |                           |                   |                 |                                      | 18,051,161                            | 12,533,916                |
| 1908              | 9,562,038              | \$1,000,000               |                   |                 |                                      | 10,562,038                            | 11,799,956                |
| 1909              | 9,180,700              |                           |                   |                 |                                      | 9,180,700                             | 10,390,395                |
| 1910              | 8,183,300              |                           |                   |                 |                                      | 8,183,300                             | 10,050,733                |
| 1911              | 26,896,790             |                           |                   |                 |                                      | 26,896,790                            | 9,556,325                 |
| 1912              | 8,262,367              |                           |                   |                 |                                      | 8,262,367                             | 11,663,193                |
| 1913              | 8,300,508              |                           |                   |                 |                                      | 8,300,508                             | 8,791,905                 |
| 1914              | 15,931,922             |                           |                   |                 |                                      | 15,931,922                            | 10,437,941                |
| 1915              | 1,204,411              |                           |                   |                 |                                      | 1,204,411                             | 14,213,173                |
| 1916              | 13,530,000             | ( <sup>5</sup> )          |                   |                 |                                      | 13,530,000                            | 8,805,940                 |
| 1917              | 8,887,557              |                           | \$15,000          |                 |                                      | 8,902,557                             | 8,023,130                 |
| 1918              | 8,227,000              | 310,213                   |                   |                 |                                      | 8,537,213                             | 8,982,355                 |
| 1919              | 9,397,081              | 443,196                   |                   |                 |                                      | 9,840,277                             | 8,645,625                 |
| 1920              | 7,300,000              | 548,927                   |                   |                 |                                      | 7,848,927                             | 6,399,871                 |
| 1921              | 8,463,000              | 661,177                   |                   |                 |                                      | 9,124,177                             | 10,034,149                |
| 1922              | 20,266,000             | 335,871                   |                   |                 |                                      | 20,601,871                            | 8,760,134                 |
| 1923              | 14,800,000             | 559,530                   |                   |                 |                                      | 15,359,530                            | 10,045,703                |
| 1924              | 13,800,000             | 314,067                   |                   |                 |                                      | 14,114,067                            | 11,873,766                |
| 1925              | 11,890,809             |                           |                   |                 |                                      | 11,890,809                            | 10,869,452                |
| 1926              | 12,563,240             | 50,000                    |                   |                 |                                      | 12,613,240                            | 8,906,138                 |
| 1927              | 7,436,320              | 75,000                    |                   |                 |                                      | 7,511,320                             | 7,449,552                 |
| 1928              | 12,148,800             | 50,000                    |                   |                 |                                      | 12,198,800                            | 8,636,998                 |
| 1929              | 14,138,400             | 115,000                   | 190,000           |                 |                                      | 14,443,400                            | 10,254,937                |
| 1930              | 8,253,000              | 10,760,000                | 330,000           |                 |                                      | 19,403,000                            | 10,995,304                |
| 1931              | 9,087,000              | 100,000                   | 395,000           |                 |                                      | 9,582,000                             | 13,942,762                |
| 1932              | 6,971,000              | 25,100,000                | 390,000           |                 |                                      | 32,371,000                            | 26,345,915                |
| 1933              | 2,442,288              | 13,050,000                | 375,000           |                 |                                      | 15,867,288                            | 25,204,914                |
| 1934              | 3,003,000              | 8,048,000                 | 405,000           | \$103,535,000   |                                      | 114,991,000                           | 24,751,833                |
| 1935              | 860,750                |                           | 316,000           | 34,076,000      |                                      | 35,252,750                            | 40,882,912                |
| 1936              | 1,022,100              | 20,950,000                | 366,000           | 25,438,000      |                                      | 47,776,100                            | 49,849,120                |
| 1937              | 12,028,600             | 36,850,000                | 666,000           | -4,873,000      |                                      | 44,671,600                            | 52,379,804                |
| 1938              | 11,991,600             | 30,670,000                | 831,000           | 39,547,500      | \$1,100,000                          | 84,140,100                            | 65,405,810                |
| 1939              | 10,574,600             | 32,995,000                | 866,000           | -5,002,488      |                                      | 44,033,112                            | 79,329,428                |
| 1940              | 13,269,600             | 63,715,000                | 1,181,000         | 23,334          | 4,600,000                            | 83,888,934                            | 96,365,934                |
| 1941              | 9,429,600              | 63,765,000                | 1,339,000         | -119,237        | 5,700,000                            | 81,014,313                            | 85,596,484                |
| 1942              | 7,446,600              | 93,915,031                | 1,414,400         | -19,965         | 6,600,000                            | 105,356,066                           | 91,438,941                |
| 1943              | 2,651,060 <sup>6</sup> | 87,076,210                | 1,936,400         | -1,127          | 2,600,000                            | 94,262,543                            | 69,287,440                |
| 1944              | 2,422,500              | 35,853,000                | 3,335,075         | -72,709         | 5,669,468                            | 47,207,334                            | 54,587,242                |
| 1945              | 5,321,000              | 19,324,200                | 3,278,800         | -22,332         | 5,282,501                            | 33,184,169                            | 50,376,076                |
| 1946              | 34,089,290             | 84,970,500                | 3,578,600         |                 | 4,491,718                            | 127,130,108                           | 64,362,688                |
| 1947              | 36,315,968             | 77,846,135                | 3,284,245         | -30,396         | 4,806,879                            | 122,222,831                           | 123,142,887               |
| 1948              | 20,127,250             | 117,508,288               | 5,549,500         |                 | 5,545,400                            | 148,730,438                           | 176,153,466               |
| 1949              | 29,952,663             | 229,251,503               | 6,999,601         |                 | 5,293,475                            | 271,497,242                           | 243,794,856               |
| 1950              | 35,447,705             | 313,557,275               | 9,327,097         |                 | 8,084,825                            | 366,366,902                           | 298,373,537               |
| 1951              | ( <sup>7</sup> )       | 271,543,800               | ( <sup>7</sup> )  |                 | <sup>8</sup> 5,502,086               | 277,045,886                           | <sup>8</sup> 348,793,030  |
| Total             |                        |                           |                   |                 |                                      | 2,496,447,901                         | 2,331,143,833             |

<sup>1</sup> Including allotments from the reclamation fund through 1915; authorizations for increased compensation from general fund, 1918 through 1924, power and other revenues made available; and allocations from emergency funds 1934-44.

<sup>2</sup> General fund includes appropriations for operation and maintenance of the Colorado River front work and levee system and for the Colorado River Dam fund.

<sup>3</sup> Allotments prior to 1906 were canceled on July 27, 1907, at Fallon, Nev., and summary allotments issued in lieu thereof.

<sup>4</sup> Total expenditures for 1903-6, as follows: 1903, \$269,094; 1904, \$1,513,431; 1905, \$3,767,922; 1906, \$7,107,716.

<sup>5</sup> Excludes appropriation of \$100,000 to Secretary of the Interior for Imperial Valley protection.

<sup>6</sup> Includes appropriation of \$100,000 to Bureau of Reclamation for Bonneville.

<sup>7</sup> All funds merged into the general fund appropriation in fiscal year 1951.

<sup>8</sup> Estimate.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, the table shows expenditures by years, also, but I am informed that the expenditures and obligated funds for the fiscal year 1951 will be only about three hundred million. An examination of these figures for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949 shows conclusively that the Republican Eightieth Congress led the way in recognizing western needs for an expedited program. There are no grounds for the accusations that western

water resources developments were delayed because certain western Senators and Representatives, including both Republicans and Democrats, asked for information regarding the proposed undertakings. The record is against that interpretation.

Respecting the Missouri Basin plan as approved in 1944, about \$250,000,000 have been spent on reclamation phases by the Interior agencies out of a total authorization of \$550,000,000. Corps of

Engineers expenditures on the same plan now aggregate about \$300,000,000 out of a total authorization of five hundred and fifty million for their plans.

This work is moving along fast, and it is being done in accordance with our traditional principles of law and individual and State rights. The Congress has provided that the use of water for navigation shall not interfere with any other beneficial use; that is to say, navigation has no priority to the use of the waters of the Missouri River system. The Congress also has provided that the rights and interests of these States "in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and likewise their interests and rights in water utilization and control" shall be recognized and protected. The provisions are contained in the authorizing legislation for the Missouri Basin works. Reclamation laws and several Supreme Court decrees had previously held these principles to be inviolate for works under the reclamation law. These are strongly established principles. They do not fit easily into a scheme of federalization of the natural resources of the Missouri Basin States.

#### STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, which provides that the bill be read for noncontroversial committee amendments, I ask that we may proceed, with the understanding that if at this time there has been filed with the clerk an amendment to any committee amendment, that committee amendment shall be considered as being a controversial item and shall be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement, the committee amendment on page 4, in line 6, will be passed over.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 4, in line 8, after the word "than", to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$7,500,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think that amendment relates to the preceding one; therefore it should be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Acquisition of buildings abroad," on page 5, line 5, after the word "act", to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$7,000,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "of which not to exceed \$94,500 shall be available for personal services, and."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, that committee amendment should go over, for an amendment is pending to it.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be passed over.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contributions to international organizations," on page 6, line 2, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$27,000,000" and insert "\$30,297,861, together with such additional sums due to increase in rates of exchange as the Secretary of State may determine and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury to be necessary to pay, in foreign currencies, the quotas and contributions required by the several treaties, conventions, or laws established by the amount of the obligation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether he has submitted an amendment to limit contributions of the United States to one-third, or, in other words, a modification of the language adopted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCARRAN. That has been offered, and it is in the general provisions in the back of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Missions to international organizations," on page 7, line 6, after the figures "\$1,400,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$1,179,540 shall be available for personal services"; and in line 13, after the word "Organization", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That employment under this appropriation in connection with the organization of American States may be without regard to the civil-service laws."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International contingencies," on page 8, line 9, after the word "business", to insert "medical and hospital expenses (not incurred as a result of vicious habits, intemperance, or misconduct) of members of United States delegations while in a travel status outside the United States"; and in line 17, after "(44 U. S. C. 111)", to strike out "2,600,000" and insert "\$2,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico," on page 9, line 9, after the word "protection", to insert "expenditures for the purposes set forth in sections 101 through 104 of Public Law 786, approved September 13, 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses," on page 9, line 20, after the figures "\$900,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$737,550 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 10, line

6, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "\$14,000,000" and insert "\$12,000,000, of which not to exceed \$1,188,939 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "American sections, international commissions," on page 12, line 2, after the word "Commissions", to strike out "\$702,000" and insert "\$687,200, of which not to exceed \$268,888 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 10, to strike out:

#### INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to enable the Commission to settle certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments as authorized by Public Law 455, approved March 10, 1950, including expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purpose of this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles for field use only; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and employment of aliens; \$150,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International information and educational activities," on page 14, line 24, after the figures "\$5,000", to insert "purchase (not to exceed nine) for use abroad and"; on page 15, line 5, after the word "amended", to insert "expenses for hospitalization and medical care of grantees who become incapacitated while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 22, after the word "organization", to strike out "\$85,000,000" and insert "\$63,000,000, of which not to exceed \$25,830,000 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is an amendment to that amendment, and it should go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 22, after the word "films", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for subscriptions to or distribution of any privately edited or published magazines, journals or newspapers unless copies thereof are regularly filed with the Secretary of the Senate and with the Clerk of the House of Representatives at the time of distribution."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Justice—Legal activities and general administration—Salaries and expenses, general administration," on page 20, line 5, after the figures "\$2,250,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$2,145,690 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities," on page 20, line 13, after the figures "\$9,032,000", to insert "of

which not to exceed \$7,774,150 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is an amendment pending to that, and it should therefore go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, Anti-trust Division," on page 20, line 17, after the figures "\$3,200,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$3,035,932 shall be available for personal services, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals," on page 21, line 11, after the figures "\$12,990,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$10,316,390 shall be available for personal services, and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry," on page 22, line 7, after the word "expenses", to insert "and of which not to exceed \$219,800 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Bureau of Investigation—Salaries and expenses," on page 23, line 12, after the figures "\$90,000,000", to insert, "of which not to exceed \$78,473,211 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Immigration and Naturalization Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 25, line 8, after the figures "\$36,400,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$30,159,900 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Prison System—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons," on page 26, line 9, after the figures "\$23,500,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$15,387,450 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Support of United States prisoners," on page 27, line 6, after the figures "\$2,000,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$217,200 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Alien Property—Salaries and expenses," on page 27, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$3,600,000" and insert "\$300,000", and in line 21, after the word "Columbia", to insert "of which not to exceed \$2,900,000 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary," on page 30, line 9, after the figures "\$1,000", to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$1,484,530, of which not to exceed \$1,363,230 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.



The next amendment was, on page 30, line 17, after the figures "\$250,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$224,280 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Census," on page 31, line 8, after the figures "\$6,500,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$5,623,973 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 20, after the figures "\$7,000,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$5,646,654 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 11, after the figures "\$200,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$147,312 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Administration," on page 33, line 7, after the figures "\$99,100,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$75,971,477 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 9, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000, of which not to exceed \$4,965,300 shall be available for personal services and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 22, after the figures "\$1,200,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$916,063 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 5, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert "\$1,257,984, of which not to exceed \$828,145 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 13, after "June 30", to strike out "1954" and insert "1958"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$35,840,000" and insert "\$28,700,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is an amendment to be offered to the amendment on page 36, line 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment on page 36, line 13, will be passed over. The clerk will report the next amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 36, in line 14, after "(1)", to strike out "\$17,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say that, so far as I am concerned, it is unnecessary to have this amendment go over. I want to congratulate the committee on the economies which have been made in connection with this item, which is rapidly becoming another form of local pork barrel. I think the committee has done extremely well, and I do not want to cut the appropriation any further.

Mr. McCARRAN. We will revert to it later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 36, in line 19, after "(6)", to strike out

"\$15,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000"; in line 22, after "(7)", to strike out "\$2,840,000" and insert "\$2,700,000"; in line 25, after the word "which", to strike out "\$2,840,000" and insert "\$2,700,000"; in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$450,000"; and on page 37, line 4, after the word "aircraft", to insert "and not to exceed \$1,937,447 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 14, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "\$225,000" and insert "\$350,000, of which not to exceed \$315,753 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 19, after the word "contracts", to strike out "\$1,883,000" and insert "\$1,874,562, of which not to exceed \$75,937 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 38, to insert:

Transport Aircraft Development: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 867), relating to the development of improved transport aircraft, including hire of aircraft; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem; \$597,500, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$22,500 shall be available for personal services.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is an amendment to be offered to this amendment, and it should go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment at the desk.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask that it go over. I drafted an amendment to eliminate this appropriation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Board," on page 38, line 18, after the word "field", to insert "purchase (not to exceed four for replacement only) and."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, that should go over, also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 38, in line 20, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$3,550,000" and insert "\$3,700,000, of which not to exceed \$3,354,000 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 39, line 22, after the word "law", to strike out "\$12,375,000" and insert "\$11,877,688, of which not to exceed \$8,075,810 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce," on page 40, line 19, after the figures "\$3,000,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$2,641,869 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 5, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$1,900,000" and insert "\$1,-

953,000, of which not to exceed \$1,593,000 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 12, after the word "individuals", to strike out "\$5,500,000" and insert "\$5,388,180, of which not to exceed \$4,606,380 shall be available for personal services, and."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall have an amendment to offer on page 41, line 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment under consideration now is the amendment on page 41, line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on page 41, line 19, after the word "Secretary", I move to insert the words "including not to exceed \$99,000 for personal services."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Patent Office," on page 42, line 6, after the figures "\$11,500,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$8,834,000 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Public Roads," on page 43, line 10, after the word "expended", to insert "including not to exceed \$8,563,500 for personal services."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is an amendment to be offered to this amendment, and it should go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over. The next amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 13, after the numerals "1951", to insert "and of which not to exceed \$2,914,200 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 19, to insert:

Public Lands Highways: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the act of September 7, 1950, \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, to that there is an amendment to be offered, and it should go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 2, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$3,480,000, of which not to exceed \$180,000 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 22, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000, of which not to exceed \$315,900 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 2, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$3,000,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement, that amendment should go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.



The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Bureau of Standards," on page 48, line 2, after the figures "\$1,100,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$490,203 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 6, after the word "for", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$3,807,419, of which not to exceed \$3,083,228 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 16, after the word "frequency", to strike out "\$2,800,000" and insert "\$2,735,220, of which not to exceed \$1,483,020 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 10, to strike out:

Working capital fund: For an additional amount for the "Working capital fund," established by the Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1950, \$2,000,000, to be available without fiscal-year limitation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Weather Bureau," on page 50, line 2, after the word "Committee", to strike out "\$26,000,000" and insert "\$25,069,477, of which not to exceed \$18,229,710 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions—Department of Commerce," on page 51, after line 18, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 305. Appropriations of the Department of Commerce available for salaries and expenses shall be available in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 for entertainment within or outside the United States of prominent persons, representatives, and dignitaries of foreign governments. The cost of such entertainment, including the reimbursement of officials of the Department of Commerce who have incurred expenses for such entertainment, shall be accounted for solely on the certificate of the Secretary of Commerce.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—The Judiciary—Supreme Court of the United States—Care of the Building and Grounds," on page 53, line 8, after the figures "\$160,700", to insert "of which not to exceed \$144,000 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, with reference to page 53, line 8, I move that the figure "\$144,000" be stricken and that the figure "\$147,500" be inserted in lieu thereof. This is not an appropriation, but a limitation on personal services. This change is necessary, inasmuch as \$3,500 of the amount carried under other contractual services is, in fact, personal services, and the total personal services in the budget should be \$147,500 instead of \$144,000. This change is in accordance with the Ferguson amendment and would have been made in the committee had the information been available to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the amendment being submitted as an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to, and the committee amendment as amended, is agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Court of Customs and Patent Appeals—Salaries and expenses," on page 53, line 16, after the figures "\$194,500", to insert "of which not to exceed \$176,715 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Customs Court—Salaries and expenses," on page 53, line 24, after the figures "\$433,165", to insert "of which not to exceed \$401,165 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Court of Claims—Salaries and expenses," on page 54, line 11, after the figures "\$579,800", to insert "of which not to exceed \$495,580 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous expenses," on page 57, line 24, after "(34 Stat. 476)", to strike out "\$750,000" and insert "\$768,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Administrative Office of the United States Courts," on page 58, line 24, after the figures "\$535,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$488,500 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Expenses of referees", on page 60, line 4, after "(11 U. S. C. 68 (c) (4))", to insert "of which not to exceed \$300,010 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated," on page 61, line 10, after the word "expenses", to insert "including not to exceed \$263,274 for personal services", and in line 12, after the word "prisoners", to insert "including not to exceed \$344,796 for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title VI—General provisions," on page 63, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 602. None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to pay an assessment to any international organization which exceeds one-third of the total annual cost thereof.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 602. No representative of the United States Government in any international organization hereafter shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33 1/3 percent of the budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States in excess of 33 1/3 percent of the budget, a commitment requiring a United States appropriation of a large proportion may be made after consultation by United States representatives in the organization or other

appropriate officials of the Department of State with the Committees on Appropriation of the Senate and House of Representatives: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the inter-American organizations.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is interested in this amendment, and perhaps he would want it to go over.

Mr. DIRKSEN. On which page is the amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. Page 63.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be passed over.

The next amendment was, on page 64, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 603. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant after August 1, 1951, through the fiscal year 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(d) to the Department of Justice, except general administration personnel;

(e) to the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(f) to the judiciary branch;

(g) to the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

(h) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2: *Provided further*, That when any department or agency covered in this Act has reduced their employment rolls to 80 percent of the total number on their rolls as of August 1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 65, to insert:

SEC. 603. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, when we were considering noncontroversial amendments we inadvertently adopted the committee amendment on page 65, lines 1 to 14, to which the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] desires to offer an amendment. I believe the amendment of the Senator from Arizona is a good amendment. It has been approved by the Department.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 65, lines 1



to 14, was agreed to be reconsidered, in order that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] may offer the amendment in behalf of his colleague the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment which I ask to have stated. It is the amendment which was intended to be offered by my colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 65, line 14, after the word "reporting", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That this section shall not apply to personnel work concerning employees of the Foreign Service of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to. Without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, after line 14, to insert:

SEC. 604. Except for the automobiles officially assigned to the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce and automobiles assigned for operation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose primary duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 66, to insert:

SEC. 605. No part of the money appropriated by this act to any department or made available for expenditure by any corporation contained in this act which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the aggregate budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such department or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material, shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2). No person whose only performance of the functions described in (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence is in activities necessary for the enforcement of law, promotion of safety of human life, dissemination of weather information, or scientific experimentation, or whose compensation is paid from funds appropriated specifically for International Information and Educational Activities shall be deemed to be engaged in the performance of the functions so described.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 606. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place two positions in grade GS-18, and seven positions in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be in lieu of any positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation previously allocated under section 505. The compensation of the Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation hereafter shall be \$17,500 per annum.

The Secretary of State hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place one additional position in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949.

The Secretary of Commerce hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place one additional position in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 4, to change the section number from "604" to "607."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the committee amendments, with the exception of those which have been passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, that brings us back to the amendment with which we were dealing when we entered into the unanimous-consent agreement, which is the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to advise that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] submitted amendments a short time ago, one on page 20, line 17, and the other on page 20, line 5, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McCARRAN. Those amendments were filed today under the unanimous-consent agreement, and they go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

#### REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is a true saying that no law, no matter how good it may be, can be of value to a nation, if not properly administered. Fair administration, of course, is the final measure of a law's effectiveness.

The Senator from Michigan, together with the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], are of the opinion that the President of the United States and those who, under him, execute the laws, are not going to enforce and carry out the provisions and intent of the Defense Production Act of 1951. That has been demonstrated by statements in the press. It has also been demonstrated today by a message from the President to the Congress.

The purpose of the Defense Production Act is to curb inflation, but if it is not adequately enforced it is not going to have that effect. There are many persons who feel that the President is not sincere in his efforts to enforce the law; that he is now advocating certain changes for political reasons, rather than with a sincere desire to halt inflation.

The law which we passed last September was clear, and it gave to the President full power and control over prices and wages as a means of combating inflation. He did not see fit to use his authority until about the 26th day of January of this year. Then its enforcement was such that he accompanied it by repeated demands for a new law. When a new law was passed he condemned it from the outset of its enactment.

From that background, Mr. President, it is the opinion of the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from California, and the Senator from Idaho that we should now introduce a bill repealing certain provisions of the act to which the President objects, and that the President of the United States should be enabled to enforce a law in relation to price control and the fixing of wages under terms that he desires, so that there can be no question about his enforcement of the law.

We have in the past found numerous instances of the Executive's failure to enforce laws because they were not in harmony with the opinion of the President. In this case we feel it is so vital to the Nation to prevent inflation that this amendment should be adopted, so that we may be provided sincere and genuine enforcement of an inflation-control measure. Therefore, we are going to ask to repeal three provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, which are the three provisions which the President singled out in his message today. The bill is as follows:

A bill to repeal certain provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the last sentence of section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby repealed.

Mr. President, this refers to the ban on slaughtering quotas:

(b) Paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of section 402 of such act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

This refers to the so-called Capehart amendment:

(c) Subsection (k) of section 402 of such act, as amended, is hereby repealed.

This refers to the so-called Herlong amendment on percentage margins for retailers and wholesalers.

On behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2048) to repeal certain provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. NIXON, and Mr. WELKER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.



Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. NIXON. In other words, the effect of the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from Michigan on behalf of himself, the junior Senator from California and the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], is to carry out the request that the President has laid before the Congress in his message of today. It would repeal the Capehart amendment, the Herlong amendment and the Butler-Hope amendment banning quotas on slaughtering of livestock. Is it not a fact that prior to the time the Defense Production Act of 1951 was passed by the Congress and became law, the President had these very powers which this bill would grant him?

Mr. FERGUSON. He did have those powers.

Mr. NIXON. In other words, the President had those powers then, and did not use them, or if he did use them, they did not prove effective, by his own admission, in controlling inflation?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. NIXON. Which means that we are simply giving the President the powers he had prior to the enactment of the Defense Production Act of this year. And we are giving him those powers because unless we give him a law which in words, in phrases, and in terms is exactly what he wants, he has in effect told the Congress that the law we passed will not be effective in controlling inflation, and that he will not try to use the law for the purpose of controlling inflation.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. Not only that, but the statements of the administrators of the law are in effect invitations for an increase of prices, and the public is taking them as such.

Mr. NIXON. As a matter of fact, what has happened is that the administration has in effect created a price-increase psychology.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. NIXON. By the constant statements of the President that the law passed by the Congress is inadequate, that it will not control inflation, and that prices can go no place but up.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. NIXON. Thereby inviting prices to go up, and encouraging the scare buying which, of course, is one of the major factors in increasing prices.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I am sure the Senator from California agrees with and is sponsoring the amendment for the purpose of really having a law which the President will enforce.

Mr. NIXON. That is exactly the point. I think the Senator from Michigan has well stated that those of us who supported the Defense Production Act of 1951 recognized the need for power to control inflation. It is our opinion, and it is also the opinion of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], that the law passed by the Congress, if honestly

and properly enforced by the President, would be effective in controlling inflation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that to be a fact. I think the Senator from South Carolina also made such a statement as of yesterday on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. NIXON. But the President stated in his message of today that the law is ineffective, and impliedly, as I have suggested, that he will not use it for that purpose. Therefore, the purpose of our bill is to give him the power which he says he needs properly to control inflation, powers, incidentally, which he already had during the first 6 months of this year and for the last 3 months of last year, and did not use to control inflation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad the Senator has made that statement. I concur in it.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Has the Senator any idea that the President would enforce any law the Congress might pass, whether he likes it or not, to prevent inflation which the party to which he belongs has been promoting for the last 14 years?

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course, if history can be relied upon, and it surely can be relied upon in many cases, I would say that there is great doubt that the President has really wanted to keep down inflation. The facts speak for themselves.

Mr. BRICKER. In other words, at the present time, the President of the United States, through his administration, and through the price-and-wage-control program which he has so ineffectively put into operation is promoting inflation. He knows that inflation is going to take place so long as the Government expends what it is expending now, and what he seeks to expend in the future, and so long as that occurs, prices are bound to go up, and nothing will prevent that from happening. So this is simply a cheap political trick to try to put the blame upon the Congress of the United States for what has happened as a result of his program. I for one do not think that because he becomes political in this kind of an effort the Congress ought to abdicate its authority, and give him what he asks.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I think the remarks of the Senator from Ohio are entirely uncalled for, particularly in view of the fact that in the Banking and Currency Committee there was a group of Senators who repeatedly tried to undermine the measures which the President of the United States, and his administrators, several of them Republicans, I might say, have asked to be provided by Congress, to protect the American people against rising prices. When any Senator stands on the Senate floor and attacks the sincerity of the President in his efforts to hold prices against inflation, he makes an absolute misstatement of the facts.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I want to say very frankly that the question of inflation in this country is not one of control of prices or wages. Inflation, if anyone understands the economics of it, is the inevitable result of less goods and of more money, and since the United States Government is continuing to pour out money as it is now, and as it will in the years which are immediately ahead under the program the President has instituted and will continue to carry out as long as he is in office—so long as that goes on, we are going to have inflation in prices and everything else in this country. I for one believe the administration wants inflation to continue, because it has a pleasant effect upon the public morale, an effect upon the voters of the Nation. They feel that they are economically healthy, but fail to realize that the ultimate collapse is going to come.

The only true prevention for inflation is holding down the money supply and the production of goods and things which people want to buy. The defense production bill was promoted by the committee and passed by the Congress with the idea of promoting production for war and to make the things which people want to buy and which they need in their daily lives, so that they will have an adequate supply of the things for which they have the money to buy. The bill is a production bill to see to it that American business, American manufacturing, American industry, is not curbed in its production except for war purposes. Just so long as it is possible to squeeze the profits out of business, so long as it is possible to curb the production of this country to the point where people will not be able to buy the things they want in their daily living, for which they will have the money to pay, so inevitably under this spending program we will have the socialistic cry in this country that business has failed, that industry cannot produce what we need here. The Socialists in this administration are striving to that end so that they might come to the Congress with a demand, and, in fact, already there has been a demand made that the Government take over the absolute direction of American business. Already it has been insisted by the President of the United States that he be given the authority to put money into business by the Government of the United States in competition with the business which we will have to rely upon for continued prosperity in this country, and to produce the munitions of war which we may need.

Mr. WELKER and Mr. MOODY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan and the junior Senator from California as a cosponsor of the



measure to repeal these amendments that the President requested in his message received by the Senate about an hour ago, for the sole and simple reason that I am sick, tired, and disgusted over seeing and hearing what I think is an attempt by the administration to mislead the American people into believing that the Production Act of 1951 is not effective and will in effect promote inflation. I do not believe his rantings, but I favor this bill so that the President will have no future complaints about the Defense Production Act of 1951.

Mr. President, I want to say that I respect the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and all the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency who worked so diligently and effectively toward the perfection and passage of that measure, which I say is a good bill which is vouched for by the great chairman of Banking and Currency, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. As I say, in my heart I feel that the act is sufficient to control inflation if the administration will only try to enforce its provisions and quit using the act as a political football.

I have sat here for weeks and heard the administration say to the American people that the act is a failure, that it will not work, and that inflation is bound to increase and that prices must go up.

By its very acts the administration has sabotaged the effective features of this law. The administration has deliberately misinformed the public, the retailer, and Congress as to the effectiveness of the Defense Production Act of 1951, and by such actions has placed upon Congress the blame for any price increases. In effect the administration has invited price rises and is continuing to do so. This bill, I think, will end this ever-present conduct on the part of the President.

What law could be administered properly under such conduct as that? I join with the sponsors of this bill upon the theory that I expect to leave the ball in the court of this administration and expect them to play it. The results will be what they asked for, and let the chips fall where they may. If inflation continues, the responsibility will be on the administration, and not on the Congress, which has worked so diligently to try to get an effective law.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MOODY. I should like to ask the senior Senator from Michigan to yield before he yields the floor. I should like to ask my colleague a question.

As I understand his amendment, it is to repeal the Capehart amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MOODY. Does it provide a substitute for adjustment of prices?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not specifically. It strikes out the Capehart amendment, as requested today by the President.

Mr. MOODY. As your amendment stands, would the Price Administrator have authority to adjust prices?

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. I recognize the concern of the junior Senator from Michigan on that point. I may say that this amendment has been drawn to carry out the request of the President, as set forth in his message. As will be noted from reading the message, the President requested that the Capehart amendment be repealed, that the Herlong amendment be repealed, and that amendments which denied the power to impose slaughtering quotas be repealed. This bill simply carries out that request, and goes no further.

Let me say further that we presume that when the amendments contained in the bill which has been introduced reach the Banking and Currency Committee for consideration the committee may well find that the President should have put in his message some substitute formula for allowing price adjustments because of increased costs. I am not suggesting that that may not be the case. This bill will at least provide a vehicle upon which the committee can work in determining what action should be taken on the President's request.

Mr. MOODY. As I understand the junior Senator from California, this bill is not primarily an effort to wipe out the damaging sections of the Capehart amendment and the prohibition against roll-backs. The bill is a vehicle to place the issue before the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. NIXON. To place the issue before the Banking and Currency Committee, so that the Banking and Currency Committee may then consider whether or not the act passed by the Congress is adequate, if properly enforced by the President and the Price Administrator, to control prices. If it finds that it is not adequate, it can then take the necessary action, with this bill as the vehicle, to write an act which will be adequate.

Mr. MOODY. May I ask one further question of the junior Senator from California? As I understand it, the sponsors of the bill have possibly not endeavored to write a workable provision, but have merely proposed to repeal a provision which the President has termed to be unworkable. Is that correct?

Mr. NIXON. All we have done—and I am glad the Senator from Michigan has used the word "workable"—has been to carry out the request of the President. I, for one, would never contend that anything the President asked for would be workable.

Mr. HILL obtained the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. HILL. With the understanding that I shall not lose the floor, I should

like to yield to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HILL. I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I entered the Chamber just in time to listen to part of the impassioned remarks of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] charging that the message of the President was "playing politics."

Time and time again the President warned that the kind of defense production bill which passed the Senate, which among many other defects prohibited roll-backs, incorporated the Capehart amendment, and wiped out slaughtering quotas would inevitably lead to higher prices, to the great detriment and distress of the people of this country and to the Nation's whole economy.

Not only did the President give that warning, but many of us in the debate on this legislation gave the same warning in no uncertain terms, and begged our colleagues to meet the situation and to realize that inflation, suffering, and injustice were inevitable. Now, when we are faced with increasing inflation due to this act, the attempt is made to place the responsibility on the President.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I will not yield at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was shocked to hear the junior Senator from Ohio say that the President was trying to use this occasion as a device to excuse his administration in the discharge of its duty to carry out the terms of the act. If it is a device, it is a subterfuge, if it is an excuse—and those who oppose the President and who have opposed him are so certain that he wishes merely to find an excuse—why have they not given him the amendments for which he has asked? Why have they not given him the effective weapons to carry out the purposes of a real control act? If we had given him the weapons, and given him the formula for which he has asked, and to which in my opinion he was and is entitled, if he failed to administer the bill in the interest of the people, his critics might justly criticize. But they cannot now criticize justly—though I have no doubt they will continue to criticize—as long as they have withheld from the President the implements with which he could discharge his duty as President of the United States—his duty to all the people of the United States.

I ask that Congress, even at this late date give the President the powers for which he has asked, and accept the amendments which he has suggested. If these amendments requested by the President are accepted, and if then there is further inflation, Senators may have just cause for complaint; but not before that time.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have not the floor. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.



Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not want to cut off the Senator from Idaho. If he wishes to ask the Senator from New York a question I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Yes. I appreciate the kindness of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. With the understanding that I do not lose the floor, I am glad to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELKER. I hope the Senator from New York has read the bill which we have sent to the desk. His statements indicate that he has not read this bill. We have asked for exactly what the President of the United States demanded in his message received by the Senate about an hour ago.

Mr. President, I ask this question, Is the President sincere in this request? If he is, Why did he wait so long and send this message to the Senate 3 hours after the recess of the House of Representatives, and after they have gone home for 3 weeks, because of which, as the President well knew, it will be impossible for the House of Representatives even to consider this matter until they return about the middle of September?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I answer?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. I point out to my distinguished colleague that there is in the law enacted by the Congress a prohibition against the roll-backs which were ordered by the OPS. The provisions of the Capehart amendment were also adopted. Slaughtering quotas were wiped out. Inflation was as certain to result from the provisions of the Capehart amendment as day follows night. It could not be avoided. It has not been avoided. It is showing itself now. Inflation is rearing its ugly head, to the distress and loss of the people of the United States. Until today no effort has been made to repeal the provisions of the Capehart amendment or to give the necessary further authority, which has been asked for by the President and by some of us on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from New York. I am convinced that he has not read the bill which we have sent to the desk. For his information I should like to say that we have asked for the repeal of the Capehart amendment, the repeal of the Herlong amendment, and the repeal of the Butler-Hope amendment. They represent the three objections which the President of the United States has mentioned and which he classified in his message as the worst provisions of the act. For the information of the Senator from New York, the President did not complain about roll-backs that the Senator from New York complains about. We have done exactly what the President has asked the Senate for. As I said a moment ago, the ball is in the Senator's court. I hope the President plays it well and no longer can the sponsors of this bill be accused of trying to hurt this administration by this control bill. I think this bill will silence the President and his leaders in their complaints and he will be responsible to the American people for the

inflation which will come as a result of this administration's failure to execute a good bill—and its failure to curtail spending that it should do—if inflation is to be curtailed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the President of the United States certainly asked for roll-back powers prior to the passage of the Defense Production Act. I stood on the floor of the Senate not 10 minutes ago when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] asked some questions with respect to the effect of the bill which has been introduced. Certainly, as I heard and interpreted the answer, it was to the effect that it would not repeal the vicious effects of the Capehart amendment.

I wish to say that it is only because the unwisdom of the law has been demonstrated that the shoe pinches. I listened to the explosive and unjustified attack on the President of the United States by the junior Senator from Ohio. The President of the United States is not playing politics. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate will also not play politics.

#### STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment to increase the appropriation for the informational and educational program of the State Department, commonly known as the Voice of America. Sixty-three million dollars is now proposed in the committee amendment. Eighty-three million dollars was carried in the bill as it passed the House of Representatives.

It is of the utmost importance to avoid unnecessary outlays at an hour when we are being called on to make such vast expenditures for defense. But the key word is "unnecessary," and I am of the opinion that what we spend wisely on propaganda is as essential as what we spend wisely for military purposes.

In the mustering of strength in which we are engaged, propaganda is in the highest priority. That is why I am so deeply interested in making sure that the informational and educational program of the State Department is not gutted by mistaken action on this floor. The amount originally proposed by the President for this purpose was \$115,000,000. That was reduced by the House to \$85,000,000. The Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended \$63,000,000.

I would have been glad to support the original figure of \$115,000,000. I regard an allowance of less than \$85,000,000 as calamitous. It seems to me that those who would cut even further cannot be fully aware of the extent to which they are at odds with the national interest.

This is the kind of niggardliness Edmund Burke was talking about when he said that "parsimony requires no providence, no sagacity, no powers of combination, no comparison, no judgment."

I know that the Voice of America has been under fire. I have heard references

to "woozy mindedness," the use of outside writers and radio commentators, incompetent management, and the like. I say that, even if these charges are justified, the cure is not in cutting the heart out of the program.

The truth of the matter is that, whatever may be the faults or weaknesses of the Voice of America the best answer to such criticism is the violence with which the Soviet is reacting to our propaganda. If the Voice of America is so ineffective how has it managed to draw Communist blood? It is a queer sort of "woozy mindedness" which forces the Kremlin, which is spending a billion dollars a year to spread its lies, to publish the McMahon resolution of friendship for the Russian people. That is a crack in the Kremlin wall, as President Truman observed in his report to Congress last Monday, and he was right in crediting the Voice of America with having driven the Russians into spreading officially what had already penetrated far and wide among their people.

It is a queer sort of incompetence which has drawn from the United States Advisory Commission on Information, headed by a great journalist like Erwin D. Canham, of the Christian Science Monitor, this estimate:

The program is being efficiently administered. The personnel has been greatly improved and is being steadily enriched by specialists of larger experience and talent. The expansion authorized by the Eighty-first Congress as a campaign of truth is being effectively carried forward. The program has steadily improved in its administration. We regard the keymen in the program as skilled administrators.

Most of us have learned by now that we must rely on our military men for the best use of our armed strength. But we are not so ready to admit our limitations in the field of psychological warfare. We consider ourselves experts in the science of molding world opinion.

I am reminded of what a southern publisher said on a similar point:

The country is full of men and women who know much more about how to run a newspaper than the editors and reporters, but somehow they are doing something else.

I have just quoted from the report of the Advisory Commission on Information, which is concerned with one phase of the great global campaign of truth we are conducting. The program also includes an educational exchange activity, concerning which another advisory commission, led by Dr. Harvie Branscomb, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, has reported to Congress in these terms:

It is the opinion of this commission that on the whole this job has been well done. The Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs has given the program vigorous and forward-looking leadership.

I suggest that appraisals made and issued by distinguished journalists and educators of the caliber of Erwin Canham and Harvie Branscomb are much more impressive than horseback criticisms emanating from less qualified quarters. Surely the Senate of the United States is not ready to prefer the distortions of partisanship and prejudice to the findings of such experts.



If we deprive the Voice of America and its affiliated services of the support they merit, we rob the Nation of the effective use of a weapon incalculably valuable to our foreign policy and our survival. I simply cannot understand the logic of Senators who fail to recognize this fact. They talk as though they want to withhold a favor from a government agency, when what is actually involved is limiting the use of the one technique available to us in the world-wide struggle for men's minds.

Returning recently from a long stay in Europe, Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, head of the National Broadcasting Co. and the Radio Corp. of America, and surely an authority in the field of communications, issued a statement calling for a half-billion dollar appropriation for the Voice of America. To be sure, he recommends a separate agency to conduct such an expanded enterprise; but that is not the issue before us at this juncture. What is relevant is his demand for greatly increased financial support of what we refer to as the Voice of America.

I regard his testimony as much more persuasive than the reasons given for a reduction of funds. Mr. Sarnoff explicitly says the State Department should not be criticized for its current effort. He argues that we should keep our eyes on the fact that "the task of telling the American story has grown increasingly complex and urgent." Obviously, to measure up to that challenge, we must strengthen our information program, not amputate it.

Let us make no mistake about it, Mr. President: Drastic amputation is unavoidable unless we give the USIE enough money to operate on. Even if, under an appropriation of \$63,000,000, radio operations could be kept up to the present level, all other phases of the international information program, including exchange of persons, motion pictures, libraries, and information centers would either be liquidated or cut down to a merely marginal status. The Russians rely considerably on the printed page to carry their message, but we would be denied the use of books, magazines, libraries, and information centers as weapons of counter propaganda.

We have heard from Mr. Sarnoff, who emphasizes that we are not spending enough on international information. Yet, hampered and prevented from expanding as it should, the Voice of America is actually boring behind the iron curtain and making the impression we desire.

Sixteen Polish mutineers recently took a Red minesweeper into a Swedish port. These sailors said they had been inspired to revolt by American and British broadcasts urging dissatisfied Poles to flee from Communist oppression by escaping to Sweden.

We have it on good authority that unrest in the satellite countries is a major problem for the Kremlin. We are certainly interested in seeing to it that this ferment keeps on harassing Moscow. We know that the Voice of America is contributing to this process. Yet, in-

stead of encouraging its efforts, instead of doing everything in our power to enhance its performance, efforts to stifle it seem to be the order of the day.

We are appropriating billions of dollars for defense in military terms, Mr. President. I wholeheartedly support this policy. This year, for the present fiscal year alone, we shall appropriate more than \$70,000,000,000 for military purposes, for our defense in military terms. If we include atomic energy and similar weapons and programs, our appropriations for these purposes may even go beyond \$70,000,000,000.

We must become strong enough to preserve peace, or if the worst should come to defend our Nation. Without a great army, navy, and air force, we cannot attain the strategic position we must occupy if we are to remain a free people, if all mankind is not to writhe under Soviet domination.

But we would be foolish to rely on armed strength alone.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to call attention to a letter from Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, written under date of July 8, 1951, addressed to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. In his letter General Collins says:

I welcome this opportunity to give you my views on the importance—

"The importance," Mr. President—of the United States International Information and Educational Exchange Program for fiscal year 1952. While I do not profess to know the details of the program, I heartily endorse this approach toward solving one of the most critical problems of our times—the battle for men's minds.

Then General Collins says in his letter:

Too often in the past, in my judgment, while forced to take some steps toward military preparedness, we have been reluctant to engage a potential enemy in battles of ideas. To most Americans propaganda has always had an evil connotation. We have had a tendency to overlook the value of propaganda as a force for good as well as evil. It is time we changed our approach. I, as a military man, feel strongly that along with our essential military programs there should be a concurrent information program of a scope and dynamic character that can materially aid in reducing the chances of another world war.

General Collins continues by calling attention to the fact that—

We must make maximum use of every medium of communication we possess: radio, press, advertisements, motion pictures, and personal contacts.

Then he calls attention to the fact that in his judgment our fighting men in Korea have been helped by the campaign we have waged by propaganda among our Communist enemies, and he says that—

We estimate that a goodly percentage of the 200,000 Communist prisoners were influenced in their decision to surrender by our psychological warfare efforts.

He continues as follows in his letter:

The program you are considering is based on the sound and practical approach that

the battle for the hearts and loyalties of men is a fundamental part of our national security efforts during these critical times.

Then he emphasizes the fact that even if war should come, these programs, which we would set up now, and which he urges, and which I join him in urging, would be of tremendous value to us in the waging of that war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that General Collins' letter may be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ARMY,  
THE CHIEF OF STAFF,  
July 8, 1951.

Hon. PAT McCARRAN,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: I welcome this opportunity to give you my views on the importance of the United States International Information and Educational Exchange program for fiscal year 1952. While I do not profess to know the details of the program, I heartily endorse this approach toward solving one of the most critical problems of our times—the battle for men's minds.

Too often in the past, in my judgment, while forced to take some steps toward military preparedness we have been reluctant to engage a potential enemy in battles of ideas. To most Americans propaganda has always had an evil connotation. We have had a tendency to overlook the value of propaganda as a force for good as well as evil. It is time we changed our approach. I, as a military man, feel strongly that along with our essential military programs there should be a concurrent information program of a scope and dynamic character that can materially aid in reducing the chances of another world war.

We must face the fact that we are now confronted with an intangible yet no less deadly attack which is being waged on us world-wide by psychological means. While we must continue the strengthening of our military forces, we must, at the same time, enter into this struggle for men's minds with every resource at our command. We must make maximum use of every medium of communication we possess—radio, press, advertisements, motion pictures, and personal contacts.

In the Army we are facing this problem, more realistically I hope, than we have heretofore, and are utilizing our psychological resources more effectively than ever before. Our experiences in Korea have justified our emphasis. We have waged an intensive psychological warfare campaign there in conjunction with our military operations, and the results have been most gratifying. Of course, it takes first-class fighting men basically to weaken an enemy's resistance but we estimate that a goodly percentage of the 200,000 Communist prisoners were influenced in their decision to surrender by our psychological warfare efforts.

The program you are considering is based on the sound and practical approach that the battle for the hearts and loyalties of men is a fundamental part of our national security efforts during these critical times. It recognizes that there would be no problem of Communist aggression if the Communists were convinced that aggression is not a paying proposition. But, if despite all of our efforts, the Communists launch another world war, I think it is important to note that the program you are considering can also provide direct benefits to the Armed Forces of our Nation and those of other free



nations. The transmitter and relay bases provided for in the so-called Ring plan would be extremely valuable to the Armed Forces who, in time of war, would have responsibility for the operation of those transmitters in active theaters of military operations. As I have mentioned, psychological warfare is a more important element in the successful conduct of modern war than ever before and such resources as these would be particularly important to us if another world war is ever thrust upon us.

We are capable of great psychological advantage. But the effectiveness of our efforts to gain and hold this advantage will depend in large measure upon our determination to provide the means required. We cannot do the job part-time. We must go all-out. Only thus can we meet total force with total counterforce, and hope to convince potential aggressors that another war cannot pay.

This program should go far toward building a spirit of unity and determination among free peoples everywhere, and toward translating that spirit into action. It should be instrumental in unmasking the aggressive and imperialistic intentions of the Communists and in proving to the world that the way of free people is the only way. It is a program which when implemented with all the American vigor, boldness, and hard common sense, of which we are capable, can win the peoples of the world to our side and contribute materially to the prevention of a possible World War III.

Sincerely yours,

J. LAWTON COLLINS.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as General Collins has so well said, we do not win the hearts and minds of peoples by winning on the battlefield or even by frightening our enemy into withholding his blow. We must have a psychological and spiritual victory, if we are really to reach our goal of an incoercible freedom. For the sake of our own security, we must leave nothing undone to persuade men on every continent to help us preserve democracy as the chief assurance of hope, dignity, advancement, and freedom for all peoples in all climes.

It is just that doctrine which our Government is proclaiming through the information program of the State Department. It seems to me that all Senators should be eager to encourage this enterprise. The issue before us is whether we shall grant it sufficient funds to make it a dynamic factor in the ideological struggle now convulsing mankind or condemn it to enervation and futility.

Only a small sum, twenty-odd millions, covers the difference between vital activity and the crippling imposed by an appropriation of \$63,000,000.

I urge the Senate to raise this figure to \$85,000,000, the amount fixed by the House, the amount which will enable our Government to demonstrate that the United States not only has a giant's strength but is capable of using it to gain the mental and moral allegiance of men and women throughout the world to our cause—the cause of peace and freedom. Without this allegiance we cannot win.

#### JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Japanese treaty which is about to be signed on the West coast is receiving considerable publicity as a great victory for the United States of America. Senators will remember that, some weeks

ago, England violently objected to the proposed Japanese treaty, urged by Mr. Dulles, an erstwhile Republican, currently employed by Mr. Acheson.

Great Britain violently objected to the Japanese peace treaty because it allowed Japanese textiles and other products to be sold in areas which England had always dominated through its own production of textiles. It will be remembered that England then suddenly withdrew its objection to the treaty.

Mr. President, it is obvious that an understanding was arrived at, under the terms of which Japan would recognize Communist China within some certain time following the ratification of the treaty by the members of the United Nations.

The treaty provided, too, that our troops were to be withdrawn within 90 days following the effective date of the treaty, unless there should be an agreement with Japan under which they would remain in Japan.

Mr. President, that this undercover agreement with Japan provides for the recognition of Communist China is very obvious, if one will but examine the news reports.

#### NEWSMEN REPORT FACTS WHICH CONGRESS IGNORES

I wish to take this occasion to compliment the newsmen. They have carefully reported the facts, but apparently the Congress of the United States pays little attention to their reports. Even Time magazine, in its July 23 issue of this year, commenting on the terms of the Japanese peace treaty, said:

Russia has been invited to San Francisco but is not likely to accept: the Kremlin demanded last month that the Japanese treaty be turned over to a Big Four conference of the United States, Russia, Britain, and Communist China, assailed the United States plan, which excludes the Chinese Reds, like the Nationalists, from signing the treaty.

Then, parenthetically, it says:

Japan will be free to choose later which Chinese regime it wishes to make peace with.

Mr. President, this was not the only dispatch. There were several dispatches appearing in the press at that time, which made it very plain that this arrangement definitely had been made.

#### JAPAN WILL NEED CHINA

It does not require an expert to determine that Japan could not possibly exist without trading with China, buying raw materials from China, and selling manufactured products to China, when we stop supporting her out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. President, it was obvious during the negotiations at Kaesong, Korea, up to the time they were discontinued, that all we could hope for through any treaty or armistice would be an agreement on our part to stay out of Communist China, and out of Russia's way, while she consolidated her gains in China. That would be within the next 10, 15, or 18 months, whatever time it took Russia to complete the job of murdering the Nationalist Chinese leaders.

#### COMMUNIST AGGRESSION PATTERN

It would mean a Communist China, and most students of Asia agree that

the Communists' next move would be to continue down through Burma.

The Reds now control northern Korea, where we used to obtain a good deal of tungsten, after we had shut down our own mines because of the free-trade policy initiated by our own socialist administration. The rice crop, which fills the food basket of that part of Asia, would next be cut off from the Malayan states in Indochina, and it would then only be a matter of time until these nations would be gathered in, and the consolidation of Asia would be complete.

With the Chinese Communists and the Russians in power in China, Japan would of necessity recognize the Communist regime. Thus the way is paved for the control by Russia of Japan, China, and all of Asia.

Mr. President, in the agreement regarding troop occupation, there will no doubt be conditions imposed upon our troops remaining in Japan, conditions which will be unfavorable to us. Past experience has taught us to expect this.

Mr. President, a dispatch in this morning's Wall Street Journal, by Ray Cromley, gives a very good outline of the treaty. The title of the article is "A Treaty Nobody Likes—Most Nations Involved Are Cool Toward Japanese Pact."

Mr. President, all the dispatches, if carefully read, lead to one conclusion, namely, that the Japanese Nation will be without protection and that there is no provision in the treaty to prevent the joining of the Communist nations in Asia, starting with China.

#### EDEN RECOMMENDS SUPRANATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on some press dispatches on the world federation which is being advocated by some of the Nation's leaders, including some United States Senators. I refer to a speech of Mr. Anthony Eden at Chicago, reported by the Chicago Daily Tribune of August 23. The article, an editorial, in fact, reads, in part, as follows:

Anthony Eden, former British Foreign Secretary and deputy leader of the Conservative opposition, took advantage of the opportunity of a hired hall in Chicago to urge the United States to abate its present ideas of national sovereignty as a contribution to world peace. He said that the Atlantic Pact wasn't broad enough. The suggestion was that America subordinate its interests to the authority of some supranational organization.

We are curious why Mr. Eden has not offered this proposal to his countrymen and, in particular, to the socialist regime now in charge of the British Government. The English have refused to subscribe to any international movement that would deprive them of a jot of their own sovereignty.

They have refused to have any truck with the idea of a European political union, with the Schuman plan for pooling western European iron and coal resources, or with the project of a common European army intimated by France, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, and Luxembourg. The British Government position is that enunciated a year ago by the executive committee of the Labor Party, which, in rejecting any supranational authority, stated that "nations are real and cannot be conjured away by fine phrases."

Mr. Eden asks the United States to do what England herself refuses to do.











82D CONGRESS  
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 4740

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 24, 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4       in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-  
5       ments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for  
6       the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely:

7               TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

8                       SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9       For necessary expenses of the Department of State not  
10      otherwise provided for, including expenses authorized by the



1 Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-  
2 1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National  
3 Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Coopera-  
4 tion as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the Act of July  
5 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r) ; (1) *settlement of*  
6 *claims as authorized by Public Law 455, approved March*  
7 *10, 1950*; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned  
8 with activities provided for under this appropriation; hire  
9 of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of  
10 aircraft outside the continental United States; printing and  
11 binding outside the continental United States without regard  
12 to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111) ;  
13 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
14 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; purchase of uniforms; insurance of  
15 official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by  
16 law of such countries; dues for library membership in  
17 organizations which issue publications to members only, or  
18 to members at a price lower than to others; rental of tie  
19 lines and teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by  
20 contract, for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously  
21 charged and paid for passports; establishment, maintenance,  
22 and operation of passport and despatch agencies; examina-  
23 tion of estimates of appropriations in the field; ice and  
24 drinking water for use abroad; excise taxes on negotiable  
25 instruments abroad; loss by exchange; radio communica-



1 tions; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial  
2 information, telephone and similar services abroad; relief,  
3 protection, and burial of American seamen, and alien seamen  
4 in foreign countries and in the United States Territories and  
5 possessions; expenses incurred in acknowledging services of  
6 officers and crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing  
7 American seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or  
8 other catastrophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining  
9 in Egypt, Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American  
10 convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court,  
11 and care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared  
12 insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192),  
13 of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons  
14 charged with crime; and procurement by contract or other-  
15 wise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1)  
16 translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical infor-  
17 mation, (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geo-  
18 graphic aids, (4) maintenance, improvement, and repair  
19 of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries,  
20 including minor construction on Government-owned proper-  
21 ties, (5) fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased  
22 property abroad, ~~(2)and~~ (6) rental or lease, for periods not  
23 exceeding ten years, of offices, buildings, grounds, and living  
24 quarters for the use of the Foreign Service, for which pay-  
25 ments made be made in advance ~~(3)and~~ (7) *not to exceed*



1 \$200,000 for maintenance and operation of commissary and  
 2 mess services; ~~(4)\$73,000,000~~ \$74,487,777 ~~(5)~~, of which  
 3 not to exceed \$56,079,253 shall be available for personal  
 4 services: *Provided*, That not less than ~~(6)\$10,000,000~~  
 5 \$7,500,000 of this appropriation shall be used to purchase  
 6 foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treas-  
 7 ury of the United States for carrying out the purposes of this  
 8 appropriation: *Provided further*, That pursuant to section  
 9 201 (c) of the Act of June 30, 1949 (41 U. S. C. 231c),  
 10 passenger motor vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service  
 11 abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allow-  
 12 ances or proceeds of such sales shall be available without  
 13 fiscal year limitation for replacement of an equal number of  
 14 such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance,  
 15 of each such replacement shall not exceed \$3,000 in the case  
 16 of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission  
 17 and \$1,400 in the case of all other such vehicles except sta-  
 18 tion wagons.

#### 19 REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

20 For representation allowances as authorized by sec-  
 21 tion 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.  
 22 S. C. 1131), \$675,000.



## ACQUISITION OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

For carrying into effect the Act of July 25, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 295b), including the initial alterations, repair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said Act, ~~(7)\$8,000,000~~ \$7,000,000, ~~(8)~~ of which not to exceed \$94,500 shall be available for personal services, and which is exclusively for expenditure under the provisions of said Act which relate to payments representing the value of foreign property or credits: *Provided*, That, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of State or such Assistant Secretary as he may designate, section 6 of the Act of May 7, 1926, may be construed as including leaseholds of not less than ten years.

## EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR

## SERVICE

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, to be expended pursuant to the requirement of section 291 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 107), \$9,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State may delegate to subordinate officials the authority vested in him by section 291 of the Revised Statutes pertaining to certification of expenditures.



## 1        CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

2        For expenses necessary to meet annual obligations to  
3 international organizations, the Government of Panama, and  
4 Gorgas Memorial Institute, pursuant to treaties, conventions,  
5 or specific Acts of Congress, ~~(9)\$27,000,000~~ \$30,297,861  
6 ~~(10)~~, *together with such additional sums due to increase in*  
7 *rates of exchange as the Secretary of State may determine*  
8 *and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury to be necessary*  
9 *to pay, in foreign currencies, the quotas and contributions*  
10 *required by the several treaties, conventions, or laws estab-*  
11 *lished by the amount of the obligation: Provided, That the*  
12 Department of State, when requested by the United  
13 Nations, is authorized to acquire surplus property for the  
14 United Nations in accordance with existing surplus property  
15 disposal laws and regulations, and the contribution of the  
16 United States to the United Nations shall be reduced by  
17 the value of the surplus property and necessary expenses,  
18 including transportation costs. incidental to the acquisition  
19 thereof.

## 20        MISSIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

21        For expenses necessary for permanent representation to  
22 certain international organizations in which the United States  
23 participates pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific  
24 Acts of Congress, including expenses authorized by the  
25 pertinent Acts and Conventions providing for such repre-



1   sentation; attendance at meetings of societies or associations  
2   concerned with the work of the organizations; salaries, ex-  
3   penses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as  
4   authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended  
5   (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); purchase (not to exceed one,  
6   for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;  
7   printing and binding, without regard to section 11 of the Act  
8   of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); and purchase of uni-  
9   forms for guards and chauffeurs, \$1,400,000 (11), *of which*  
10   *not to exceed \$1,179,540 shall be available for personal serv-*  
11   *ices: Provided, That the provisions of section 8 of the United*  
12   *Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, and regula-*  
13   *tions thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant*  
14   *to that Act, may be applicable to the obligation and expendi-*  
15   *ture of funds in connection with United States participation*  
16   *in the International Civil Aviation Organization (12): Pro-*  
17   *vided further, That employment under this appropriation in*  
18   *connection with the Organization of American States may*  
19   *be without regard to the civil service laws.*

#### 20                   INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES

21       For necessary expenses of participation by the United  
22   States upon approval by the Secretary of State, in inter-  
23   national activities which arise from time to time in the  
24   conduct of foreign affairs and for which specific appropria-  
25   tions have not been provided pursuant to treaties, conven-



1 tions, or special Acts of Congress, including personal services  
2 without regard to civil-service and classification laws; salaries,  
3 expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as  
4 authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended  
5 (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); employment of aliens; travel ex-  
6 penses without regard to the Standardized Government  
7 Travel Regulations and without regard to the rates of per  
8 diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the  
9 Travel Expense Act of 1949; not to exceed \$15 per diem  
10 in lieu of subsistence for persons serving without compensa-  
11 tion in an advisory capacity while away from their homes or  
12 regular places of business; (13) *medical and hospital expenses*  
13 *(not incurred as a result of vicious habits, intemperance, or*  
14 *misconduct) of members of United States delegations while in*  
15 *a travel status outside the United States; rent of quarters by*  
16 *contract or otherwise; hire of passenger motor vehicles; con-*  
17 *tributions for the share of the United States in expenses of*  
18 *international organizations; and printing and binding without*  
19 *regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44*  
20 *U. S. C. 111); (14) ~~\$2,600,000~~ \$2,500,000, of which not to*  
21 *exceed a total of \$100,000 may be expended for representa-*  
22 *tion allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Act of*  
23 *August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131) and for entertainment.*



1 INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,  
2 UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

3 For expenses necessary to enable the United States to  
4 meet its obligations under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905,  
5 1906, 1933, and 1944 between the United States and  
6 Mexico, and to comply with the other laws applicable to  
7 the United States Section, International Boundary and  
8 Water Commission, United States and Mexico, including  
9 operation and maintenance of the Rio Grande rectification,  
10 canalization, flood control, bank protection, boundary fence,  
11 and sanitation projects; detailed plan preparation and con-  
12 struction (including surveys and operation and maintenance  
13 and protection during construction) ; Rio Grande emergency  
14 flood protection; ~~(15)~~*expenditures for the purposes set forth*  
15 *in sections 101 through 104 of Public Law 786, approved*  
16 *September 13, 1950*; purchase of three passenger motor  
17 vehicles for replacement only; purchase of planographs and  
18 lithographs; and leasing of private property to remove there-  
19 from sand, gravel, stone, and other materials, without regard  
20 to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41  
21 U. S. C. 5) ; as follows:

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For salaries and expenses, regular boundary activities,  
24 including examinations, preliminary surveys, and investi-



gations, \$900,000 (16), of which not to exceed \$737,550 shall be available for personal services.

### CONSTRUCTION

For detailed plan preparation and construction of projects authorized by the Convention concluded February 1, 1933, between the United States and Mexico, the Acts approved August 19, 1935, as amended (22 U. S. C. 277-277f), August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 961), June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1463), June 28, 1941 (22 U. S. C. 277f), September 13, 1950 (Public Law 786), and the projects stipulated in the treaty between the United States and Mexico signed at Washington on February 3, 1944, (17)\$14,000,000 \$12,000,000 (18), of which not to exceed \$1,188,939 shall be available for personal services, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for the lower Rio Grande flood-control project for construction on any land, site, or easement in connection with this project except such as has been acquired by donation and the title thereto has been approved by the Attorney General of the United States: *Provided further*, That expenditures for the Rio Grande bank-protection project shall be subject to the provisions and conditions contained in the appropriation for said project as provided by the Act approved April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 89): *Provided further*, That unexpended balances of appropriations for construction under the International Boundary and



1 Water Commission available for the next preceding fiscal  
2 year shall be merged with this appropriation and shall  
3 continue available until expended.

4 RIO GRANDE EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION

5 For emergency flood-control work, including protection,  
6 reconstruction, and repair of all structures under the juris-  
7 diction of the International Boundary and Water Com-  
8 mission, United States and Mexico, threatened or damaged  
9 by floodwaters of the Rio Grande, which have heretofore  
10 been authorized and erected under the provisions of treaties  
11 between the United States and Mexico, or in pursuance of  
12 Federal laws authorizing improvements on the Rio Grande,  
13 \$30,000, to be merged with the unobligated balance of the  
14 appropriation for this purpose for the next preceding fiscal  
15 year, and to remain available until expended.

16 AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

17 For expenses necessary to enable the President to per-  
18 form the obligations of the United States pursuant to con-  
19 ventions between the United States and Canada signed  
20 May 26, 1930 (50 Stat. 1355) and January 29, 1937  
21 (50 Stat. 1351), treaties between the United States and  
22 Great Britain, in respect to Canada, signed January 11,  
23 1909 (36 Stat. 2448) and February 24, 1925 (44 Stat.  
24 2102), the treaty between the United States and Canada  
25 signed February 27, 1950, and Convention between the



1 United States and Costa Rica signed May 31, 1949, including  
2 stenographic reporting services by contract; hire of passenger  
3 motor vehicles; the United States share of the expenses of  
4 the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, the  
5 International Fisheries Commission, and the Inter-American  
6 Tropical Tuna Commission, which except for the expenses  
7 of the members, may be advanced to the respective Com-  
8 missions; ~~(19)\$702,000~~ *\$687,200* ~~(20)~~, *of which not to*  
9 *exceed \$268,888 shall be available for personal services,*  
10 *to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State*  
11 *and to be available also for additional expenses of the Amer-*  
12 *ican Sections, International Commissions, as hereinafter set*  
13 *forth:*

14 International Joint Commission, United States and  
15 Canada, the salary of one Commissioner on the part of the  
16 United States who shall serve at the pleasure of the Presi-  
17 dent (the other Commissioners to serve in that capacity  
18 without compensation therefor) ; salaries of clerks and other  
19 employees appointed by the Commissioners on the part of  
20 the United States with the approval solely of the Secretary  
21 of State; travel expenses and compensation of witnesses in  
22 attending hearings of the Commission at such places in the  
23 United States and Canada as the Commission or the Ameri-  
24 can Commissioners shall determine to be necessary; and  
25 special and technical investigations in connection with mat-



1   ters falling within the Commission's jurisdiction: *Provided*,  
 2   That the Secretary of State is authorized to transfer to any  
 3   department or independent establishment of the Government,  
 4   with the consent of the head thereof, funds from this appro-  
 5   priation for direct expenditure by such department or estab-  
 6   lishment for such investigations.

7       International Boundary Commission, United States,  
 8   Alaska, and Canada, the completion of such remaining work  
 9   as may be required under the award of the Alaskan Bound-  
 10   ary Tribunal and the existing treaties between the United  
 11   States and Great Britain; commutation of subsistence to em-  
 12   ployees while on field duty, not to exceed \$6 per day each  
 13   (but not to exceed \$3 per day each when a member of a  
 14   field party and subsisting in camp) ; hire of freight and pas-  
 15   senger motor vehicles from temporary field employees; and  
 16   payment for timber necessarily cut in keeping the boundary  
 17   line clear.

18       (21) INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS COMMISSION

19       For expenses necessary to enable the Commission to  
 20   settle certain claims of the Government of the United States  
 21   on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals  
 22   against foreign governments as authorized by Public Law  
 23   455, approved March 10, 1950, including expenses of attend-  
 24   ance at meetings of organizations concerned with the pur-  
 25   pose of this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles



1 for field use only; services as authorized by section 15 of  
2 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and employ-  
3 ment of aliens; \$150,000.

4 INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL  
5 ACTIVITIES

6 For expenses necessary to enable the Department of  
7 State to carry out international information and educational  
8 activities as authorized by the United States Information  
9 and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U. S. C. 1431-  
10 1479) and the Act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 501).  
11 and to administer the programs authorized by section 32 (b)  
12 (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50  
13 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b) ), the Act of August 24, 1949 (20  
14 U. S. C. 222-224), and the Act of September 29, 1950  
15 (Public Law 861), including employment, without regard  
16 to the civil-service and classification laws, of (1) persons on  
17 a temporary basis (not to exceed \$120,000), (2) aliens  
18 within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service  
19 in the United States relating to the translation or narration  
20 of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be  
21 investigated for such employment in accordance with pro-  
22 cedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney  
23 General); travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for  
24 service in the United States and dependents to and from the  
25 United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of per-



1 sonnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service  
2 Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158) ; expenses  
3 of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided  
4 for under this appropriation (not to exceed \$8,000) ; enter-  
5 tainment within the United States (not to exceed \$5,000) ;  
6 **(22)***purchase (not to exceed nine) for use abroad and hire of*  
7 *passenger motor vehicles; purchase of space in foreign*  
8 *language publications abroad, without regard to the pro-*  
9 *visions of law set forth in 44 U. S. C. 322; services as au-*  
10 *thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5*  
11 *U. S. C. 55a) ; advance of funds notwithstanding section*  
12 *3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; (23)**expenses for*  
13 *hospitalization and medical care of grantees who become*  
14 *incapacitated while participating in activities authorized*  
15 *under this appropriation; actual expenses of preparing and*  
16 *transporting to their former homes the remains of persons,*  
17 *not United States Government employees, who may die*  
18 *away from their homes while participating in activities*  
19 *authorized under this appropriation; establishment and*  
20 *operation of agricultural and other experiment and*  
21 *demonstration stations in other American countries,*  
22 *on land acquired by gift or lease, and construction of neces-*  
23 *sary buildings thereon; radio activities and acquisition and*  
24 *production of motion pictures and visual materials and pur-*  
25 *chase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor,*



1 narration, script-writing, translation, and engineering serv-  
2 ices, by contract or otherwise; and purchase of objects for  
3 presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organiza-  
4 tions \$85,000,000 (24), of which not to exceed \$33,200,000  
5 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That not  
6 to exceed \$50,000 may be used for representation abroad:  
7 (25)*Provided further*, That \$10,000,000 shall be available  
8 for the exchange of persons: *Provided further*, That, not-  
9 withstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Re-  
10 vised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the De-  
11 partment of State is authorized in making contracts for the  
12 use of the international short-wave radio stations and facili-  
13 ties, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the  
14 owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from  
15 such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose  
16 against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or  
17 property arising from such use of said radio stations and  
18 facilities: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of lease-  
19 hold interests payments may be made in advance for the  
20 entire term or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That funds  
21 herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than  
22 75 per centum of the effective daily broadcasting time from  
23 any person or corporation holding an international short-wave  
24 broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Com-  
25 mission without the consent of such licensee: *Provided fur-*



1 *ther, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for*  
 2 *payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of*  
 3 *contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of*  
 4 *motion-picture films (26): Provided further, That no part of*  
 5 *this appropriation shall be expended for subscriptions to or*  
 6 *distribution of any privately edited or published magazines,*  
 7 *journals or newspapers unless copies thereof are regularly*  
 8 *filed with the Secretary of the Senate and with the Clerk of*  
 9 *the House of Representatives at the time of distribution.*

#### 10 PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION

11 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
 12 thority granted under this head in the Department of  
 13 State Appropriation Act, 1949, \$3,000,000, to be con-  
 14 solidated with appropriations heretofore made under said  
 15 head; and the unobligated balance of such consolidated  
 16 appropriation shall remain available during the current fiscal  
 17 year upon the terms and conditions specified under this  
 18 head; and the unobligated balance of such consolidated  
 19 for expenses of liquidation of activities in the Philippines  
 20 carried out pursuant to section 302 (a) of the Philippine  
 21 Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.  
 22 1782, 1791 (e)), and for carrying out the purposes of  
 23 section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946,



1 as authorized by section 3 of the Act of July 2, 1948 (Public  
2 Law 882).

3 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

4 SEC. 102. Contracts entered into in foreign countries  
5 involving expenditures from any of the appropriations under  
6 this title shall not be subject to the provisions of section  
7 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22).

8 SEC. 103. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6  
9 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the pro-  
10 visions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his  
11 absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate  
12 the employment of any officer or employee of the Department  
13 of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States  
14 whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or  
15 advisable in the interests of the United States.

16 SEC. 104. The exchange of funds for payment of ex-  
17 penses in connection with the operation of diplomatic and  
18 consular establishments abroad shall not be subject to the  
19 provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31  
20 U. S. C. 543).

21 SEC. 105. Appropriations under this title available for  
22 expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the  
23 continental United States, including travel of dependents and  
24 transportation of personal effects, household goods, or auto-  
25 mobiles of such personnel, shall be available for such ex-



1   penses when any part of such travel or transportation begins  
2   in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in  
3   that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or  
4   transportation may not be completed during the current fiscal  
5   year.

6       SEC. 106. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 16a  
7   of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78 (a) ), Govern-  
8   ment-owned vehicles may be used in foreign countries for  
9   transportation of United States Government employees from  
10  their residence to the office and return when public trans-  
11  portation facilities are unsafe or are not available: *Provided,*  
12  That each Chief of Mission shall have prior authority from  
13  the Secretary of State to approve such transportation.

14       SEC. 107. During the current fiscal year and when pur-  
15  chases are made with foreign currencies, the Department of  
16  State is authorized to purchase for use abroad any passenger  
17  motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station  
18  wagons), at a cost of not to exceed the equivalent of \$2,200  
19  for each such vehicle.

20       SEC. 108. Appropriations under this title for "Sala-  
21  ries and expenses", "International contingencies", and  
22  "Missions to international organizations" are available for  
23  reimbursement of the General Services Administration for  
24  security guard services for protection of confidential files.



1 This title may be cited as the "Department of State  
2 Appropriation Act, 1952".

### 3 TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

#### 4 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION 5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

6 For expenses necessary for the administration of the  
7 Department of Justice and for examination of judicial offices,  
8 including purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for re-  
9 placement only; miscellaneous and emergency expenses  
10 authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his  
11 Administrative Assistant; special attorneys and special as-  
12 sistants to the Attorney General; and examination of esti-  
13 mates of appropriations in the field; (27)\$2,250,000  
14 \$2,320,600 (28), of which not to exceed \$2,145,690 shall  
15 be available for personal services.

#### 16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

17 For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the  
18 Department of Justice not otherwise provided for, including  
19 miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or ap-  
20 proved by the Attorney General or his Administrative  
21 Assistant; and advances of public moneys pursuant to law  
22 (31 U. S. C. 529); \$9,032,000 (29), of which not to  
23 exceed \$7,774,150 shall be available for personal services.



SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, ~~(30)\$3,200,000~~ \$3,700,000, ~~(31)~~of which not to exceed \$3,035,932 shall be available for personal services, and of which \$125,000 shall be available exclusively for activities in connection with railroad reparations cases: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be expended for the establishment and maintenance of permanent regional offices of the Antitrust Division.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

AND MARSHALS

For necessary expenses of the offices of United States attorneys and marshals and United States district attorneys in Alaska, including purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles (one van for replacement only at not to exceed \$2,500, and one bus for replacement only at not to exceed \$15,000) ; services in Alaska in collecting evidence for the United States when specifically directed by the Attorney General; and firearms and ammunition; \$12,990,000, ~~(32)~~of which not to exceed \$10,316,390 shall be available for personal services, and of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for the employment of temporary deputy marshals in lieu of bailiffs at a rate not to exceed \$10 per day.



## 1 FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

2 For expenses, mileage, and per diems of witnesses and  
3 for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law;  
4 and not to exceed \$160,000 for such compensation and  
5 expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses) or infor-  
6 mants pursuant to section 1 of Public Law 626, approved  
7 July 28, 1950; \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the  
8 sum herein appropriated shall be used to pay any witness  
9 more than one attendance fee for any one calendar day.

## 10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF

## 11 JAPANESE ANCESTRY

12 For expenses necessary for payment of claims of persons  
13 of Japanese ancestry, pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948  
14 (50 U. S. C. 1981-1987), \$725,000, of which not to exceed  
15 \$225,000 shall be available for administrative expenses  
16 (33), and of which not to exceed \$219,800 shall be available  
17 for personal services.

## 18 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

## 19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For expenses necessary for the detection and prosecu-  
21 tion of crimes against the United States; protection of the  
22 person of the President of the United States; acquisition,  
23 collection, classification and preservation of identification  
24 and other records and their exchange with the duly author-  
25 ized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities,



1 and other institutions; and such other investigations regard-  
2 ing official matters under the control of the Department of  
3 Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by  
4 the Attorney General, including purchase (not to exceed  
5 four hundred for replacement only) and hire of passenger  
6 motor vehicles; purchase at not to exceed \$10,000, for  
7 replacement only, of one armored motor vehicle; firearms  
8 and ammunition; not to exceed \$150,000 for repairs and  
9 alterations at the Federal Bureau of Investigation Training  
10 Center, Quantico, Virginia; not to exceed \$10,000 for taxi-  
11 cab hire to be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in  
12 this paragraph; not to exceed \$4,500 for expenses of  
13 attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the  
14 purposes of this appropriation; payment of rewards when  
15 specifically authorized by the Attorney General for infor-  
16 mation leading to the apprehension of fugitives from justice;  
17 and not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies  
18 of a confidential character, to be expended under the direc-  
19 tion of the Attorney General and to be accounted for solely  
20 on his certificate; \$90,000,000 (34), of which not to exceed  
21 \$78,473,211 shall be available for personal services: Pro-  
22 vided, That of the amount herein appropriated \$100,000 is to  
23 be held as a reserve for emergencies arising in connection  
24 with kidnapping, extortion, and bank robbery, to be released  
25 for expenditure in such amounts and at such times as the At-



1   torney General may determine: *Provided further*, That the  
2   compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be \$20,000  
3   per annum so long as the position is held by the present  
4   incumbent.

5       None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau  
6   of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of  
7   any civil-service employee.

8       IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

9               SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10       For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for  
11   the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to  
12   immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, includ-  
13   ing advance of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while en  
14   route; payment of allowances (at a rate not in excess of  
15   \$1 per day) to aliens, while held in custody under the  
16   immigration laws, for work performed; payment of rewards  
17   for information leading to the apprehension or conviction  
18   of violators of the immigration laws; not to exceed  
19   \$35,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential  
20   character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney  
21   General and accounted for solely on his certificate; not to  
22   exceed \$5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of  
23   organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropria-  
24   tion; purchase (not to exceed one hundred and fifty for  
25   replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles;

1 purchase (not to exceed four for replacement only) and  
 2 maintenance and operation of aircraft; firearms and ammu-  
 3 nition; refunds of head tax, maintenance bills, immigra-  
 4 tion fines, and other items properly returnable, except  
 5 deposits of aliens who become public charges and de-  
 6 posits to secure payment of fines and passage money;  
 7 operation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of build-  
 8 ings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto;  
 9 reimbursement of the General Services Administration for  
 10 security guard services for protection of confidential files;  
 11 and maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and  
 12 transportation of alien enemies and their wives and de-  
 13 pendent children, including return of such persons to place  
 14 of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be  
 15 authorized by the Attorney General; \$36,400,000 (35), of  
 16 which not to exceed \$30,159,900 shall be available for per-  
 17 sonal services.

## 18 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

### 19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

20 For expenses necessary for the administration, opera-  
 21 tion, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional  
 22 institutions, including not to exceed \$490,000 for depart-  
 23 mental personal services; not to exceed \$13,500 for expenses  
 24 of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with



1 the purposes of this appropriation; purchase of not to exceed  
2 fourteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only,  
3 including two busses at not to exceed \$20,000 each; com-  
4 pilation of statistics relating to prisoners in Federal and  
5 non-Federal penal and correctional institutions; furnishing  
6 of insignia, uniforms, and other distinctive wearing apparel  
7 necessary for employees in the performance of their official  
8 duties; payment pursuant to law of claims of employees for  
9 loss, damage, or destruction of personal property (31  
10 U. S. C. 238) ; firearms and ammunition; payment of  
11 rewards for the apprehension, or for information leading to  
12 the recapture, of escaped prisoners; purchase and exchange  
13 of farm products and livestock; construction of buildings at  
14 prison camps; and acquisition of land as authorized by  
15 section 7 of the Act of July 28, 1950 (Public Law 626) ;  
16 \$23,500,000 (36), of which not to exceed \$15,387,450 shall  
17 be available for personal services: *Provided*, That there may  
18 be transferred to the Public Health Service such amounts as  
19 may be necessary, in the discretion of the Attorney General,  
20 for direct expenditure by that Service for medical relief for  
21 inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions.

22 BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

23 For constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary  
24 buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional  
25 institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto,

1 by contract or force account, \$470,000, of which \$360,000  
 2 is for liquidation of authority granted under this head in  
 3 the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1950, to enter  
 4 into contracts for replacement of a power plant at the  
 5 United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas: *Pro-*  
 6 *vided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used  
 7 for work performed under this appropriation.

#### 8 SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

9 For support of United States prisoners in non-Federal  
 10 institutions and in the Territory of Alaska, including neces-  
 11 sary clothing and medical aid, and payment of rewards for  
 12 the apprehension, or for information leading to the recap-  
 13 ture, of escaped prisoners; \$2,000,000 (37), *of which not to*  
 14 *exceed \$217,200 shall be available for personal services.*

#### 15 OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

#### 16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 The Attorney General, or such officer as he may desig-  
 18 nate, is hereby authorized to pay out of any funds or other  
 19 property or interest vested in him or transferred to him pur-  
 20 suant to or with respect to the Trading with the Enemy Act  
 21 of October 6, 1917, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.), neces-  
 22 sary expenses incurred in carrying out the powers and duties  
 23 conferred on the Attorney General pursuant to said Act:  
 24 *Provided*, That not to exceed (38) ~~\$3,600,000~~ \$3,000,000  
 25 shall be available in the current fiscal year for the general



1 administrative expenses of the Office of Alien Property,  
2 including rent of private or Government-owned space in the  
3 District of Columbia (39), of which not to exceed \$2,900,000  
4 shall be available for personal services; purchase of not  
5 to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement  
6 only; and expenses of attendance at meetings of organiza-  
7 tions concerned with the purposes of this authorization:  
8 *Provided further*, That on or before November 1 of the  
9 current fiscal year, the Attorney General shall make a report  
10 to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the  
11 House of Representatives giving detailed information on all  
12 administrative and nonadministrative expenses incurred dur-  
13 ing the next preceding fiscal year in connection with the  
14 activities of the Office of Alien Property: *Provided further*,  
15 That of the total amount herein authorized the amount of  
16 \$100,000 is to be transferred to the appropriation for  
17 "Salaries and expenses, general administration", Depart-  
18 ment of Justice.

19 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

20 SEC. 202. Not to exceed \$350,000 in the aggregate  
21 from the appropriations made in this title for general ad-  
22 ministration, general legal activities, and United States at-  
23 torneys and marshals shall be available, without regard to  
24 the Classification Act of 1949, for compensation (not to  
25 exceed \$11,000 per annum) of special attorneys and special

1 assistants to the Attorney General and to United States  
2 attorneys not otherwise provided for: *Provided*, That re-  
3 ports be submitted to the Congress on the 1st of July and  
4 January showing the names of the persons employed under  
5 the foregoing limitation, the annual rate of compensation  
6 or amount of any fee paid to each, together with a descrip-  
7 tion of their duties.

8 SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated by this title  
9 may be used to pay the compensation of any person here-  
10 after employed as an attorney (except foreign counsel em-  
11 ployed in special cases) unless such person shall be duly  
12 licensed and authorized to practice as an attorney under  
13 the laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

14 SEC. 204. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the  
15 offices of the United States attorney and the United States  
16 marshal for the District of Columbia from all appropriations  
17 in this title shall be reimbursed to the United States from  
18 any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit  
19 of the District of Columbia.

20 SEC. 205. Appropriations and authorizations made in  
21 this title which are available for expenses of attendance at  
22 meetings shall be expended for such purposes in accordance  
23 with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General.

24 SEC. 206. Appropriations and authorizations made in  
25 this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for



1 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,  
2 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

3 This title may be cited as the "Department of Justice  
4 Appropriation Act, 1952".

### 5 TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### 6 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

7 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the  
8 Office of the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this  
9 title referred to as the Secretary) including services as  
10 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
11 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per  
12 diem; and teletype news service (not exceeding \$1,000):  
13 ~~(40)\$1,500,000~~ \$1,484,530 ~~(41)~~, of which not to exceed  
14 \$1,363,230 shall be available for personal services.

15 Technical and scientific services: For expenses neces-  
16 sary for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and  
17 engineering information to business and industry as author-  
18 ized by the Act of September 9, 1950 (Public Law 776),  
19 including not to exceed \$2,000 for services as authorized  
20 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),  
21 \$250,000 ~~(42)~~, of which not to exceed \$224,280 shall be  
22 available for personal services: *Provided*, That moneys here-  
23 after received by the Secretary pursuant to section 3 of said  
24 Act of September 9, 1950, for publications provided there-

1 under, shall be available for reimbursing any appropriation  
2 as provided by said section.

### 3 BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

4 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Census: For ex-  
5 penses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing  
6 current census statistics provided for by law; for searching  
7 census records and supplying information with respect to age  
8 and citizenship certification; and for general administration,  
9 including enumerators at rates to be fixed without regard  
10 to the Classification Act of 1949; and services as authorized  
11 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a),  
12 at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem;  
13 \$6,500,000 (43), of which not to exceed \$5,623,973 shall  
14 be available for personal services.

15 Seventeenth decennial census: For expenses necessary  
16 for taking, compiling, and publishing the seventeenth decen-  
17 nial census including the census of housing as authorized by  
18 law (13 U. S. C. 201-219; 42 U. S. C. 1442), including  
19 personal services at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of  
20 Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949;  
21 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
22 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and compensation of employees  
23 of the Department of Commerce and other departments and  
24 independent establishments of the Government who may be



1 detailed for field work; \$7,000,000 (44), of which not to  
2 exceed \$5,646,654 shall be available for personal services to  
3 remain available until December 31, 1952, and to be merged  
4 with the appropriation made under this head in the Depart-  
5 ment of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1951.

6 Censuses of business, transportation, manufactures and  
7 mineral industries: For expenses necessary to prepare for  
8 taking, compiling, and publishing the censuses of business,  
9 transportation, manufactures and mineral industries as  
10 authorized by law, including personal services by contract or  
11 otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce  
12 without regard to the Classification Act of 1949; services as  
13 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
14 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per  
15 diem; and additional compensation of Federal employees tem-  
16 porarily detailed for field work under this appropriation;  
17 \$200,000 (45), of which not to exceed \$147,812 shall be  
18 available for personal services, to remain available until  
19 December 31, 1953.

20 CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

21 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the  
22 Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the pro-  
23 visions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended  
24 (49 U. S. C. 401), the Act of August 8, 1950 (Public  
25 Law 670), and other Acts incident to the enforcement of

1 safety regulations; maintenance and operation of air naviga-  
2 tion facilities and air traffic control; furnishing advisory serv-  
3 ice to States and other public and private agencies in con-  
4 nection with the construction or improvement of airports  
5 and landing areas; and the disposal of surplus airports; in-  
6 cluding hire of aircraft (not exceeding \$395,000); the  
7 operation and maintenance of eighty-five aircraft; contract  
8 stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of expert  
9 and other witnesses; examination of estimates of appropria-  
10 tions in the field; purchase (not to exceed twenty, for re-  
11 placement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and  
12 purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; \$99,100,000  
13 (46), of which not to exceed \$75,971,477 shall be available  
14 for personal services, and the Departments of the Air Force,  
15 Army and Navy are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aero-  
16 nautics Administration without charge, subject to the ap-  
17 proval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement  
18 only), aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment, and hangar,  
19 line, and shop equipment surplus to the needs of such Depart-  
20 ments: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appro-  
21 priation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities,  
22 and other public authorities for expenses incurred in the  
23 maintenance and operation of airport traffic control towers.

24 Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the ac-



1 quisation and establishment by contract or purchase and hire  
 2 of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of addi-  
 3 tional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction  
 4 of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling  
 5 and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration  
 6 and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; the  
 7 acquisition of the necessary sites by lease, condemnation or  
 8 grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related  
 9 accommodations for officers and employees of the Civil Aero-  
 10 nautics Administration and the Weather Bureau stationed at  
 11 remote localities not on foreign soil where such accommoda-  
 12 tions are not otherwise available; hire of passenger motor  
 13 vehicles; and not to exceed \$200,000 for emergency repairs  
 14 and replacement of facilities damaged by fire, flood, or  
 15 storm; to remain available until expended, ~~(47)\$20,000,-~~  
 16 ~~000, \$25,000,000, (48)~~ *of which not to exceed \$4,965,300*  
 17 *shall be available for personal services, and of which*  
 18 *\$12,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred*  
 19 *under authority heretofore granted to enter into con-*  
 20 *tracts for the foregoing purposes: Provided, That au-*  
 21 *thority heretofore granted under this head to enter into*  
 22 *contracts for such purposes may be exercised until June 30,*  
 23 *1952 and may hereafter be accounted for under this head:*  
 24 *Provided further, That the consolidated appropriation under*  
 25 *this head for the next preceeding fiscal year is hereby*

1 consolidated with and made a part of this appropriation  
2 to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund: *Provided*  
3 *further*, That transfers may be made from this appropri-  
4 ation to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil  
5 Aeronautics Administration", for costs of maintenance  
6 and operation of aircraft for initial flight checking of  
7 facilities established under this appropriation (not to  
8 exceed \$325,000); for necessary expenses in connection  
9 with the transportation by air to and from and within the  
10 Territories of the United States of materials and equipment  
11 secured under this appropriation (not to exceed \$115,000);  
12 and for necessary administrative costs (not to exceed \$325,-  
13 000): *Provided further*, That the Departments of the Army,  
14 Navy, and Air Force are authorized during the current fiscal  
15 year to transfer without charge, subject to the approval of  
16 the Bureau of the Budget, air-navigation and communication  
17 facilities, including appurtenances thereto, to the Civil Aero-  
18 nautics Administration.

19 Technical development and evaluation: For expenses  
20 necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aero-  
21 nautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), relative  
22 to such developmental work and service testing as tends to  
23 the creation of improved air-navigation facilities, including  
24 landing areas, aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances,  
25 personnel, and operation methods; acquisition of necessary



1 sites by lease or grant; and operation and maintenance of five  
 2 aircraft, which shall be in addition to the number authorized  
 3 herein under the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses,  
 4 Civil Aeronautics Administration"; \$1,200,000 ~~(49)~~, of  
 5 *which not to exceed \$916,063 shall be available for personal*  
 6 *services.*

7 Maintenance and operation, Washington National Air-  
 8 port: For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-  
 9 nance, and protection of the Washington National Airport,  
 10 including purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for re-  
 11 placement only; not to exceed \$3,500 for the purchase,  
 12 cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition;  
 13 ~~(50)\$1,300,000~~ \$1,257,984 ~~(51)~~, of *which not to exceed*  
 14 *\$828,145 shall be available for personal services.*

15 Construction, Washington National Airport: For an  
 16 additional amount for construction at the Washington Na-  
 17 tional Airport, \$75,000, to remain available until expended.

18 Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For  
 19 carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of  
 20 May 13, 1946, as amended (except section 5 (a)), to be  
 21 available until June 30, ~~(52)1954 1958, (53)\$35,840,000~~  
 22 *\$28,700,000*, of which (1) ~~(54)\$17,000,000~~ *\$15,000,000*  
 23 shall be for projects in the States in accordance with section  
 24 6 of said Act, (2) \$470,000 for projects in Puerto Rico, (3)  
 25 \$30,000 for projects in the Virgin Islands, (4) \$300,000 for

1 projects in the Territory of Hawaii, (5) \$200,000 for proj-  
 2 ects in the Territory of Alaska, (6) ~~(55)\$15,000,000~~  
 3 ~~\$10,000,000~~ for liquidation of obligations incurred under  
 4 authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the  
 5 foregoing purposes and (7) ~~(56)\$2,840,000~~ \$2,700,000  
 6 shall be available as one fund for necessary planning, re-  
 7 search, and administrative expenses; including hire of pas-  
 8 senger motor vehicles; of which ~~(57)\$2,840,000~~ \$2,700,000  
 9 not to exceed ~~(58)\$500,000~~ \$450,000 may be transferred  
 10 to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aero-  
 11 nautics Administration", to provide for necessary adminis-  
 12 trative expenses, including the maintenance and operation  
 13 of aircraft ~~(59)~~, *and not to exceed \$1,937,447 shall be*  
 14 *available for personal services: Provided, That the appro-*  
 15 *priation under this head for the next preceding fiscal year*  
 16 *is hereby merged with this appropriation and the con-*  
 17 *tract authorized heretofore granted for the foregoing pur-*  
 18 *poses may hereafter be accounted for under this head.*

19 Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory  
 20 of Alaska: For expenses necessary for the maintenance,  
 21 improvement, and operation of public airports in the  
 22 Territory of Alaska, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C.  
 23 485 c-h); including arms and ammunition; ~~(60)\$225,000~~  
 24 \$350,000 ~~(61)~~, *of which not to exceed \$315,753 shall be*  
 25 *available for personal services.*



CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including contract stenographic reporting services; employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or industries serving aviation:

20 Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses: For  
21 necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including  
22 contract stenographic reporting services; employment of tem-  
23 porary guards on a contract or fee basis; salaries and traveling  
24 expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training  
25 conducted by the Government or industries serving aviation:

20 Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses: For  
21 necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including  
22 contract stenographic reporting services; employment of tem-  
23 porary guards on a contract or fee basis; salaries and traveling  
24 expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training  
25 conducted by the Government or industries serving aviation:

1 expenses of examination of estimates of appropriations in the  
 2 field; ~~(65)~~ *purchase (not to exceed four for replacement only)*  
 3 *and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and hire, operation,*  
 4 *maintenance, and repair of aircraft; ~~(66)~~ \$3,550,000 \$3,700,-*  
 5 *000 ~~(67)~~, of which not to exceed \$3,354,000 shall be avail-*  
 6 *able for personal services: Provided, That the Departments of*  
 7 *the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to transfer*  
 8 *to the Civil Aeronautics Board without charge, subject to*  
 9 *the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for*  
 10 *replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, and accessories*  
 11 *surplus to the needs of such Departments.*

#### 12 COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

13 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry  
 14 out the provisions of the Act of August 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C.  
 15 883a-883i), including purchase of not to exceed four pas-  
 16 senger motor vehicles for replacement only; lease of sites and  
 17 the erection of temporary buildings for tide, magnetic or  
 18 seismological observations; hire of aircraft; operation,  
 19 maintenance, and repair of an airplane; extra compensation  
 20 at not to exceed \$15 per month to each member of the  
 21 crew of a vessel when assigned duties as recorder or instru-  
 22 ment observer, and at not to exceed \$1 per day for each  
 23 station to employees of other Federal agencies while making  
 24 oceanographic observations or tending seismographs; not to  
 25 exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of



1 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; pay, allow-  
 2 ances, gratuities, transportation of dependents and house-  
 3 hold effects, and payment of funeral expenses, as author-  
 4 ized by law, for not to exceed 185 commissioned  
 5 officers on the active list; and pay of commissioned  
 6 officers retired in accordance with law; ~~(68)\$12,375,-~~  
 7 ~~000 \$11,877,688~~ (69), of which not to exceed \$8,075,-  
 8 810 shall be available for personal services: *Provided,*  
 9 That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air  
 10 Force are authorized during the current fiscal year to  
 11 transfer without reimbursement to the Coast and Geodetic  
 12 Survey, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget,  
 13 landing craft, launches, marine engines, electronic equipment,  
 14 automotive vehicles, parts, equipment, and supplies, excess to  
 15 the needs of such Departments, which will serve to expedite  
 16 surveys in Alaska for national defense: *Provided further,*  
 17 That during the current fiscal year, this appropriation shall be  
 18 reimbursed (to the extent and in the manner required by law  
 19 (44 U. S. C. 246) for charts sold to the general public) for  
 20 charts published by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and  
 21 furnished for the official use of the military departments of  
 22 the Department of Defense.

23 BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

24 Departmental salaries and expenses: For necessary  
 25 expenses of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce

1 at the seat of government, including the purchase of com-  
 2 mercial and trade reports, and not to exceed \$50,000 for  
 3 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
 4 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$3,000,000 **(70)**, of which not  
 5 to exceed \$2,641,869 shall be available for personal serv-  
 6 ices: *Provided*, That expenses of field studies or surveys  
 7 conducted by departmental personnel of the Bureau shall  
 8 be payable from the amount herein appropriated.

9 Field office service: For expenses necessary to operate  
 10 and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices  
 11 for the collection and dissemination of information useful in  
 12 the development and improvement of commerce throughout  
 13 the United States and its possessions, including not to exceed  
 14 \$90,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia,  
 15 **(71)**~~\$1,900,000~~ \$1,953,000 **(72)**, of which not to exceed  
 16 \$1,593,000 shall be available for personal services.

17 Export control: For expenses necessary for carrying  
 18 out the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949, as  
 19 amended, relating to export controls, including services as  
 20 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
 21 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem  
 22 for individuals, **(73)**~~\$5,500,000~~ \$5,388,180, **(74)**of which  
 23 not to exceed \$4,606,380 shall be available for personal serv-  
 24 ices, and of which not to exceed \$1,277,000 may be trans-



ferred to the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, for enforcement of the export control program, and of which not to exceed \$100,000 may be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses" under the Office of the Secretary (75), including not to exceed \$99,000 for personal services.

## PATENT OFFICE

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$75 per diem (not to exceed \$25,000); expenses of transporting to foreign governments publications of patents issued by the Patent Office; defense of suits instituted against the Commissioner of Patents; and other contingent expenses of the Patent Office: *Provided*, That the headings of the drawings for patented cases may be multigraphed in the Patent Office for the purpose of photolithography, \$11,500,000 (76), of which not to exceed \$8,834,000 shall be available for personal services.

## BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

21       General administrative expenses: Necessary expenses of  
22       administration, including advertising (including advertising  
23       in the city of Washington for work to be performed in areas  
24       adjacent thereto), purchase of fifty passenger motor vehicles  
25       for replacement only, and the maintenance and repairs of

1 experimental highways, shall be paid, in accordance with  
2 law, from appropriations available to the Bureau of Public  
3 Roads.

4 Of the total amount available from appropriations of  
5 the Bureau of Public Roads for general administrative ex-  
6 penses, pursuant to the provisions of section 21 of the Act  
7 of November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 21),  
8 \$100,000 shall be available for all necessary expenses to  
9 enable the President to utilize the services of the Bureau of  
10 Public Roads in fulfilling the obligations of the United  
11 States under the Convention on the Pan-American High-  
12 way Between the United States and Other American Re-  
13 publics (51 Stat. 152), cooperation with several govern-  
14 ments, members of the Pan American Union, in connection  
15 with the survey and construction of the Inter-American  
16 Highway, and for performing engineering service in Pan-  
17 American countries for and upon the request of any agency  
18 or governmental corporation of the United States.

19 Federal-aid highways: For carrying out the provisions  
20 of the Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented  
21 (23 U. S. C. 1-22, 24-105, 107-117), to remain available  
22 until expended, ~~(77)~~*including not to exceed \$8,563,500 for*  
23 *personal services*, \$325,000,000, which sum is composed of  
24 \$320,000,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appro-  
25 priated for the fiscal year 1950, and \$3,214,713 and



1 \$1,785,287, the latter sums being for reimbursement of the  
2 sums expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways  
3 and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by floods,  
4 hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by section 4 of the Act  
5 approved June 8, 1938, and section 7 of the Act approved  
6 July 13, 1943 (23 U. S. C. 13a and 13b).

7       Elimination of grade crossings: For the elimination  
8 of hazards to life at railroad grade crossings, to remain  
9 available until expended, \$3,000,000, which sum is a part  
10 of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal  
11 year 1943 by section 5 of the Act approved September 5,  
12 1940 (54 Stat. 869) : *Provided*, That the amounts author-  
13 ized for the elimination of grade crossing hazards by said  
14 section and apportioned to Hawaii are hereby reduced by  
15 \$188,075.

16       Forest highways: For expenses, not otherwise provided  
17 for, necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23  
18 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as  
19 amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), to remain available  
20 until expended, \$21,000,000, which sum is composed of  
21 \$2,400,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be  
22 appropriated for the fiscal year 1950, and \$18,600,000, a  
23 part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal  
24 year 1951 (78), and of which not to exceed \$2,914,200 shall  
25 be available for personal services: *Provided*, That this appro-

1 priation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construc-  
 2 tion, or alteration of buildings and sites necessary for the  
 3 storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road  
 4 construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such  
 5 item under this authorization shall not exceed \$15,000.

6 **(79)***Public Lands Highways: For the purpose of carrying*  
 7 *out the provisions of section 10 of the Act of September 7,*  
 8 *1950, \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended.*

9 Tongass Forest Highways, Alaska: For surveys, con-  
 10 struction, reconstruction, and maintenance of Tongass forest  
 11 highways in Alaska in accordance with the provisions of  
 12 section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950,  
 13 **(80)**~~\$3,500,000~~ \$3,480,000 **(81)**, of which not to exceed  
 14 \$180,000 shall be available for personal services, to remain  
 15 available until expended.

16 Access roads: During the current fiscal year, not to  
 17 exceed \$70,000 of funds remaining unexpended upon com-  
 18 pletion of access road projects authorized to be constructed  
 19 under the provisions of the Defense Highway Act of 1941,  
 20 as amended by the Act of July 2, 1942 (23 U. S. C. 106),  
 21 shall be available for the maintenance of roads and bridges  
 22 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Roads on  
 23 Government-owned land in Arlington County, Virginia.

24 War and emergency damage, Territory of Hawaii:  
 25 For the liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to



1 authority granted under this head in the Independent Offices  
 2 Appropriation Act, 1948, \$2,000,000, to remain available  
 3 until expended.

4 Inter-American Highway: For necessary expenses of  
 5 continuing the survey and construction of the Inter-American  
 6 Highway, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of  
 7 December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section  
 8 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, ~~(82)\$4,000,-~~  
 9 ~~000 \$2,000,000 (83)~~, of which not to exceed \$315,900 shall  
 10 be available for personal services, to remain available until  
 11 expended.

12 Access roads (Act of September 7, 1950): For an  
 13 additional amount for "Access roads (Act of September 7,  
 14 1950)", ~~(84)\$1,000,000~~ \$3,000,000, to remain available  
 15 until expended.

16 General provisions—Bureau of Public Roads: None of  
 17 the money appropriated for the work of the Bureau of Public  
 18 Roads during the current fiscal year shall be paid to any  
 19 State on account of any project on which convict labor shall  
 20 be employed, but this provision shall not apply to labor  
 21 performed by convicts on parole or probation.

22 During the current fiscal year authorized engineering or  
 23 other services in connection with the survey, construction,  
 24 and maintenance, or improvement of roads may be per-  
 25 formed for other Government agencies, cooperating foreign

1 countries and State cooperating agencies and reimbursement  
2 for such services (which may include depreciation on engi-  
3 neering and road-building equipment used) shall be credited  
4 to the appropriation concerned.

5 During the current fiscal year appropriations for the  
6 work of the Bureau of Public Roads shall be available for  
7 expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement,  
8 care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment  
9 for distribution to projects under the supervision of the  
10 Bureau of Public Roads, or for sale or distribution to other  
11 Government activities, cooperating foreign countries and  
12 State cooperating agencies, and the cost of such supplies  
13 and materials or the value of such equipment (including the  
14 cost of transportation and handling) may be reimbursed to  
15 current applicable appropriations.

16 Appropriations to the Bureau of Public Roads may be  
17 used in emergency for medical supplies and services and  
18 other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of em-  
19 ployees engaged on hazardous work under that Bureau, and  
20 for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the  
21 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates for  
22 individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem.

#### 23 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

24 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions  
25 of the Act approved March 3, 1901, as amended (15



1 U. S. C. 271-278; Public Law 619, approved July 22,  
2 1950), including not to exceed \$700,000 for improvements  
3 to buildings, grounds, and other plant facilities, as author-  
4 ized by section 2 of the Act of July 21, 1950 (Public  
5 Law 618); building of temporary experimental structures;  
6 purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for  
7 replacement only; and not to exceed \$100,000 for services  
8 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
9 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; as follows:

10       Operation and administration: For the general opera-  
11 tion and administration of the Bureau; improvement and  
12 care of the grounds; plant equipment; and maintenance and  
13 protection of buildings, including repairs and alterations  
14 thereto; \$1,100,000 (85), *of which not to exceed \$490,203*  
15 *shall be available for personal services.*

16       Research and testing: For research, testing and other  
17 activities, as authorized by the Act of July 22, 1950 (Public  
18 Law 619), and not otherwise provided for, (86)~~\$4,000,000~~  
19 ~~\$3,807,419~~ (87), *of which not to exceed \$3,083,228 shall be*  
20 *available for personal services.*

21       Radio propagation and standards: For development and  
22 maintenance of primary standards of measurement of elec-  
23 trical quantities at radio frequencies; calibrating and certify-  
24 ing radio measuring instruments, apparatus, and standards in  
25 terms of the national primary standards; investigation of the

1 phenomena affecting the propagation of radio waves; and  
 2 the broadcasting of radio signals of standard frequency;  
 3 ~~(88)\$2,800,000~~ \$2,735,220 ~~(89)~~, of which not to exceed  
 4 \$1,483,020 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*,  
 5 That during the current fiscal year the maximum base rate  
 6 of compensation for employees appointed pursuant to  
 7 the Act of July 21, 1950 (Public Law 618), shall  
 8 be \$6,400 per annum: *Provided further*, That the  
 9 Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are  
 10 authorized, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the  
 11 Budget, to transfer without charge to the National Bureau  
 12 of Standards materials, equipment, and supplies, surplus to  
 13 their needs and necessary for the establishment, mainte-  
 14 nance, and operation of Arctic ionosphere observation  
 15 stations.

16 Construction of laboratories: For payment of obliga-  
 17 tions incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head  
 18 in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1951,  
 19 \$3,800,000, to remain available until expended.

20 ~~(90)Working capital fund: For an additional amount for~~  
 21 ~~the "Working capital fund", established by the Deficiency~~  
 22 ~~Appropriation Act, 1950, \$2,000,000, to be available with-~~  
 23 ~~out fiscal year limitation.~~

#### 24 WEATHER BUREAU

25 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the



1 Weather Bureau, including maintenance and operation of air-  
2 craft; not to exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized by  
3 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;  
4 not to exceed \$10,000 for maintenance of a printing office in  
5 the City of Washington, as authorized by law; and not to  
6 exceed \$10,000 for the United States contribution to the  
7 cost of the secretariat of the International Meteorological  
8 Committee; ~~(91)\$26,000,000~~ \$25,069,477 ~~(92)~~, of which  
9 not to exceed \$19,500,000 shall be available for personal  
10 services: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the  
11 maximum amount authorized under section 3 (a) of the Act  
12 of June 2, 1948 (15 U. S. C. 327), for extra com-  
13 pensation to employees of other Government agencies for  
14 taking and transmitting meteorological observations, shall  
15 be \$5 per day; and the maximum base rate of pay authorized  
16 under section 3 (b) of said Act, for employees conducting  
17 meteorological investigations in the Arctic region, shall be  
18 \$5,000 per annum, except that not more than five of such  
19 employees at any one time may receive a base rate of \$7,500  
20 per annum, and such employees may be appointed without  
21 regard to the Classification Act of 1949: *Provided further*,  
22 That such sums, as may be determined by the Director of  
23 the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary, may be transferred  
24 from this appropriation to the appropriation to the Depart-  
25 ment of State for "Contributions to International Organi-

1 zations, 1952", for contribution to the International Civil  
2 Aviation Organization for the United States share of the  
3 costs of the meteorological installation in Iceland, when said  
4 installation is transferred for operation under the "Agree-  
5 ment on Air Navigation Services in Iceland".

6 GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

7 SEC. 302. During the current fiscal year applicable ap-  
8 propriations and funds available to the Department of Com-  
9 merce shall be available for the activities specified in the  
10 Act of October 26, 1949 (Public Law 390), to the extent  
11 and in the manner prescribed by said Act.

12 SEC. 303. Appropriations of the Department of Com-  
13 merce available for salaries and expenses shall be avail-  
14 able for attendance at meetings of organizations concerned  
15 with the activities for which the appropriations are made.

16 SEC. 304. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6  
17 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the  
18 provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce  
19 may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal  
20 year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee  
21 of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem  
22 such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests  
23 of the United States.

24 (93) SEC. 305. *Appropriations of the Department of Com-*  
25 *merce available for salaries and expenses shall be available*



1 *in an amount not to exceed \$5,000 for entertainment within*  
 2 *or outside the United States of prominent persons, representa-*  
 3 *tives, and dignitaries of foreign governments. The cost of*  
 4 *such entertainment, including the reimbursement of officials*  
 5 *of the Department of Commerce who have incurred expenses*  
 6 *for such entertainment, shall be accounted for solely on the*  
 7 *certificate of the Secretary of Commerce.*

8       This title may be cited as the "Department of Commerce  
 9 Appropriation Act, 1952".

#### 10                   TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

##### 11                   SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

##### 12                   SALARIES

13       For the Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices, and  
 14 all other officers and employees, whose compensation shall  
 15 be fixed by the Court, except as otherwise provided by law,  
 16 and who may be employed and assigned by the Chief Justice  
 17 to any office or work of the Court, \$928,000.

##### 18                   PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

19       For printing and binding the advance opinions, prelimi-  
 20 nary prints, and bound reports of the Court, \$91,200.

##### 21                   MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

22       For miscellaneous expenses to be expended as the Chief  
 23 Justice may approve, \$58,350.

## CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed upon him by the Act approved May 7, 1934 (40 U. S. C. 13a-13d), including improvements, maintenance, repairs, equipment, supplies, materials, and appurtenances; special clothing for workmen; and personal and other services (including temporary labor without reference to the Classification and Retirement Acts, as amended), and for snow removal by hire of men and equipment or under contract without compliance with sections 3709, as amended, and 3744 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5, 16); \$160,700 (94), of which not to exceed \$147,500 shall be available for personal services.

## COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges, and all other officers and employees of the court, and necessary expenses of the court, including exchange of books, and traveling expenses, as may be approved by the chief judge, \$194,500 (95), of which not to exceed \$176,715 shall be available for personal services.



## 1 CUSTOMS COURT

## 2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For salaries of the chief judge, eight judges, and all other  
4 officers and employees of the court, and necessary expenses  
5 of the court, including exchange of books, and traveling  
6 expenses, as may be approved by the chief judge, \$433,165  
7 (96), of which not to exceed \$401,165 shall be available for  
8 personal services: *Provided*, That traveling expenses of  
9 judges of the Customs Court shall be paid upon the written  
10 certificate of the judge.

## 11 COURT OF CLAIMS

## 12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges,  
14 seven regular and six additional commissioners, and all other  
15 officers and employees of the court, and for other necessary  
16 expenses, including stenographic and other fees and charges  
17 necessary in the taking of testimony, and travel, \$579,800  
18 (97), of which not to exceed \$495,580 shall be available for  
19 personal services.

## 20 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS

21 For necessary repairs and improvements to the Court  
22 of Claims buildings, to be expended under the supervision  
23 of the Architect of the Capitol, \$9,100.

## 1 OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

## 2 HAWAII

3 For salaries of the chief justice and two associate justices  
4 of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, of judges  
5 of the circuit courts in Hawaii, and of judges retired under  
6 title 28, United States Code, section 373, \$120,000.

## 7 SALARIES OF JUDGES

8 For salaries of circuit judges; district judges (including  
9 judges of the district courts of Alaska, the Virgin Islands,  
10 the Panama Canal Zone, and Guam); and justices and  
11 judges retired or resigned under title 28, United States  
12 Code, sections 371, 372, and 373; \$5,120,000.

## 13 SALARIES OF CLERKS OF COURTS

14 For salaries of clerks of United States courts of appeals  
15 and United States district courts, their deputies, and other  
16 assistants, \$4,520,000.

## 17 PROBATION SYSTEM

18 For salaries of probation officers and their clerical as-  
19 sistants, as authorized by title 18, United States Code,  
20 sections 3654 and 3656, \$2,180,000: *Provided*, That  
21 nothing herein contained shall be construed to abridge  
22 the right of the district judges to appoint probation  
23 officers, or to make such orders as may be necessary to



1 govern probation officers in their own courts: *Provided*  
2 *further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used  
3 to pay the salary or expenses of any probation officer who,  
4 in the judgment of the chief or presiding judge certified to  
5 the Attorney General, fails to carry out the official orders  
6 of the Attorney General with respect to supervising or fur-  
7 nishing information concerning any prisoner released con-  
8 ditionally or on parole from any Federal penal or correctional  
9 institution.

10 SALARIES OF CRIERS

11 For salaries of criers as authorized by title 28, United  
12 States Code, sections 713 (a) and 755, \$542,300.

13 FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

14 For fees of the United States commissioners and other  
15 committing magistrates acting under title 18, United States  
16 Code, section 3041, including fees and expenses of concili-  
17 ation commissioners, United States courts, including the  
18 objects and subject to the conditions specified for such fees  
19 and expenses of conciliation commissioners in the Depart-  
20 ment of Justice Appropriation Act, 1937, \$543,000.

21 FEES OF JURORS

22 For fees, expenses, and costs of jurors; meals and lodging  
23 for jurors in Alaska, as provided by section 193, title II, of  
24 the Act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 362); and compensation  
25 for jury commissioners; \$2,800,000: *Provided*, That the

1 compensation of jury commissioners for the District of  
2 Columbia shall conform to the provisions of section 1401,  
3 title 11 of the District of Columbia Code.

4 MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

5 For salaries of all officials and employees of the  
6 Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for,  
7 \$2,670,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secre-  
8 taries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall  
9 be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office  
10 without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, except  
11 that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the  
12 General Schedule grades (GS) 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, as the ap-  
13 pointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk  
14 shall conform with that of the General Schedule grades  
15 (GS) 5, 7, 9, 11, or 12, as the appointing judge shall deter-  
16 mine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit  
17 if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge  
18 otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of  
19 step-increases corresponding with those provided for by title  
20 VII of the Classification Act of 1949 and of compensation  
21 paid for temporary assistance needed because of an emer-  
22 gency) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law  
23 clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed \$9,600 per  
24 annum, except in the case of the chief judge of each circuit  
25 and the chief judge of each district court having five or more



1 district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not  
2 exceed \$13,050 per annum.

3 MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

4 For miscellaneous expenses of the United States courts  
5 and their officers; rent in the District of Columbia; pur-  
6 chase of firearms and ammunition; and purchase of enve-  
7 lopes without regard to the Act of June 26, 1906 (34 Stat.  
8 476) ; ~~(98)\$750,000~~ \$768,750: *Provided*, That this appro-  
9 priation shall be available for payment of the cost of contract  
10 statistical services for the Office of Register of Wills of the  
11 District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That not to exceed  
12 \$1,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the pay-  
13 ment of fees to attorneys appointed in accordance with the  
14 Act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 625), not exceeding \$25 in  
15 any one case.

16 TRAVEL EXPENSES

17 For necessary traveling expenses, not otherwise provided  
18 for, incurred by the Judiciary, including traveling expenses  
19 of probation officers and their clerks, \$715,000: *Provided*,  
20 That this sum shall be available, in an amount not to exceed  
21 \$8,500, for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned  
22 with the work of Federal probation when incurred on the  
23 written authorization of the Director of the Administrative  
24 Office of the United States Courts.

## 1 SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

2 For salaries of court reporters for the district courts of  
3 the United States, as authorized by title 28, United States  
4 Code, section 753, \$988,200.

## 5 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

6 For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of  
7 the United States Courts, including travel, advertising, rent  
8 in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and examination  
9 of estimates for appropriations in the field, \$535,000 (99), of  
10 *which not to exceed \$488,500 shall be available for personal*  
11 *services.*

12 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, DISTRICT COURT OF THE  
13 UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

14 For repairs and improvements to the courthouse, includ-  
15 ing repair and maintenance of the mechanical equipment,  
16 and for labor and material and every item incident thereto,  
17 \$7,100, to be expended under the direction of the Architect  
18 of the Capitol.

19 REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, UNITED STATES COURT OF  
20 APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

21 For repairs and improvements to the United States  
22 Court of Appeals Building, including repair and maintenance  
23 of the mechanical equipment and for labor and material



1 and every item incident thereto, \$3,700, to be expended  
2 under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

3 SALARIES OF REFEREES

4 For salaries of referees as authorized by the Act of  
5 June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68), \$879,000 to be derived  
6 from the referees' salary fund established in pursuance of  
7 said Act.

8 EXPENSES OF REFEREES

9 For miscellaneous expenses of referees, United States  
10 courts, including the salaries of their clerical assistants,  
11 travel, purchase of envelopes without regard to the Act of  
12 June 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 476), \$1,090,000, to be derived  
13 from the referees' expense fund established in pursuance  
14 of the Act of June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68 (c) (4))  
15 (100), of which not to exceed \$800,010 shall be available  
16 for personal services.

17 GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

18 SEC. 402. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the  
19 District Court of the United States for the District of  
20 Columbia from all appropriations under this title and 30 per  
21 centum of the expenditures for the United States Court of  
22 Appeals for the District of Columbia from all appropriations  
23 under this title shall be reimbursed to the United States  
24 from any funds in the Treasury to the credit of the District  
25 of Columbia.

1 SEC. 403. The reports of the United States Court of  
2 Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not be sold for a  
3 price exceeding that approved by the court and for not more  
4 than \$6.50 per volume.

5 This title may be cited as the "Judiciary Appropriation  
6 Act, 1952".

7 TITLE V—FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES,  
8 INCORPORATED

9 The following corporation is hereby authorized to make  
10 such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing  
11 authority available to such corporation, and in accord with  
12 law, and to make such contracts and commitments without  
13 regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104  
14 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as  
15 may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in  
16 the Budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation,  
17 except as hereinafter provided:

18 Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated: Not to exceed  
19 \$327,000 of the funds of the Corporation shall be available  
20 for its administrative expenses (101), *including not to exceed*  
21 *\$263,274 for personal services*, and not to exceed \$404,000  
22 for the expenses of vocational training of prisoners (102),  
23 *including not to exceed \$344,796 for personal services*, both  
24 amounts to be computed on an accrual basis and to be deter-  
25 mined in accordance with the Corporation's prescribed ac-



1 counting system in effect on July 1, 1946, and shall be  
2 exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, expenditures  
3 which the said accounting system requires to be capitalized  
4 or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced,  
5 including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in  
6 connection with acquisition, construction, operation, mainte-  
7 nance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities  
8 and other property belonging to the Corporation or in which  
9 it has an interest.

## 10 TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

11 SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in  
12 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-  
13 poration included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary  
14 or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the  
15 Government of the United States or who is a member of an  
16 organization of Government employees that asserts the right  
17 to strike against the Government of the United States, or who  
18 advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,  
19 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by  
20 force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an  
21 affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the  
22 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions  
23 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of  
24 the United States, is not a member of an organization of  
25 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against

1 the Government of the United States, or that such person  
2 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization  
3 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the  
4 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That  
5 any person who engages in a strike against the Government  
6 of the United States or who is a member of an organization  
7 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike  
8 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-  
9 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,  
10 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by  
11 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or  
12 wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund  
13 contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon  
14 conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned  
15 for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That  
16 the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in  
17 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

18 ~~(103)SEC. 602. None of the funds appropriated in this Act~~  
19 ~~shall be used to pay an assessment to any international~~  
20 ~~organization which exceeds one-third of the total annual~~  
21 ~~cost thereof.~~

22 *SEC. 602. No representative of the United States Gov-*  
23 *ernment in any international organization hereafter shall*  
24 *make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds*  
25 *for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  per*



1 *centum of the budget of any international organization for*  
 2 *which the appropriation for the United States contribution*  
 3 *is contained in this Act: Provided, That in exceptional cir-*  
 4 *cumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States*  
 5 *in excess of  $33\frac{1}{3}$  per centum of the budget, a commitment*  
 6 *requiring a United States appropriation of a larger pro-*  
 7 *portion may be made after consultation by United States*  
 8 *representatives in the organization or other appropriate*  
 9 *officials of the Department of State with the Committees on*  
 10 *Appropriation of the Senate and House of Representatives:*  
 11 *Provided, however, That this section shall not apply to the*  
 12 *United States representatives to the Inter-American*  
 13 *organizations.*

14 **(104)SEC. 603.** No part of any appropriation or authoriza-  
 15 tion contained in this Act shall be used to pay compensation  
 16 of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position  
 17 which may become vacant after August 1, 1951 through  
 18 the fiscal year 1952: *Provided, That this inhibition shall*  
 19 *not apply—*

- 20       (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;
- 21       (b) to positions filled from within the agency;
- 22       (c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled
- 23 by appointment of the President by and with the advice and
- 24 consent of the Senate;

1       ~~(d)~~ to the Department of Justice, except general ad-  
2       ministration personnel;

3       ~~(e)~~ to the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

4       ~~(f)~~ to the Judiciary Branch;

5       ~~(g)~~ to the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

6       ~~(h)~~ to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2:

7       *Provided further, That when any department or agency*  
8       *covered in this Act has reduced their employment rolls to*  
9       *80 per centum of the total number on their rolls as of August*  
10      *1, 1951, this limitation may cease to apply.*

11       *SEC. 603. No part of any appropriation contained in*  
12       *this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee*  
13       *engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would*  
14       *be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred*  
15       *and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and inter-*  
16       *mittent employees of the agency concerned: Provided, That*  
17       *for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as*  
18       *engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in*  
19       *personnel administration consisting of direction and adminis-*  
20       *tration of the personnel program; employment, placement,*  
21       *and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee*  
22       *relations and services; training; committees of expert examin-*  
23       *ers and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administra-*  
24       *tion; and processing, recording, and reporting: Provided*



1 further, That this section shall not apply to personnel work  
2 concerning employees of the Foreign Service of the United  
3 States.

4 (105)SEC. 604. Except for the automobiles officially assigned  
5 to the Secretary of State, the Attorney General and the Secre-  
6 tary of Commerce and automobiles assigned for operation by  
7 the Federal Bureau of Investigation, no part of any appro-  
8 priation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the com-  
9 pensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the  
10 District of Columbia whose primary duties consist of acting  
11 as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor ve-  
12 hicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appro-  
13 priation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the  
14 compensation of employees performing such duties.

15 (106)SEC. 605. No part of the money appropriated by this  
16 Act to any department or made available for expenditure by  
17 any corporation contained in this Act which is in excess of  
18 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensa-  
19 tion of all persons the aggregate budget estimates for personal  
20 services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal  
21 year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such depart-  
22 ment or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance  
23 of—

24 (1) functions performed by a person designated  
25 as an information specialist, information and editorial

specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2). No person whose only performance of the functions described in (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence is in activities necessary for the enforcement of law, promotion of safety of human life, dissemination of weather information, or scientific experimentation, or whose compensation is paid from funds appropriated specifically for International Information and Educational Activities shall be deemed to be engaged in the performance of the functions so described.

(107) SEC. 606. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place two positions in grade GS-18, and seven positions in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule



1 *established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such posi-*  
 2 *tions shall be in lieu of any positions in the Federal Bureau*  
 3 *of Investigation previously allocated under section 505. The*  
 4 *compensation of the Associate Director of the Federal*  
 5 *Bureau of Investigation hereafter shall be \$17,500 per*  
 6 *annum.*

7 *The Secretary of State hereafter is authorized without*  
 8 *regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to*  
 9 *place one additional position in grade GS-17 in the General*  
 10 *Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949.*

11 *The Secretary of Commerce hereafter is authorized*  
 12 *without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of*  
 13 *1949 to place one additional position in grade GS-17 in*  
 14 *the General Schedule established by the Classification Act*  
 15 *of 1949.*

16 SEC. (108)604 607. This Act may be cited as the “De-  
 17 partments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary  
 18 Appropriation Act, 1952”.

Passed the House of Representatives July 26, 1951.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*

Passed the Senate with amendments August 24 (legis-  
 lative day, August 1), 1951.

Attest:

LESLIE L. BIFFLE,

*Secretary.*





---

## AN ACT

---

Making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 24, 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the  
Senate numbered



erans and their dependents are clearly entitled.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, if I have time I should like to yield to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is engaged in the transaction of routine business, and speeches are not in order except by unanimous consent.

Mr. LEHMAN. This is a routine matter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD—unless my colleague from New York has already done so—the full text of a letter which I sent on behalf of my colleague and myself to the administration, asking specific questions and requiring answers in detail to those questions.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, that letter was inserted in the RECORD in the course of my remarks. It happened to fit in very nicely with what I was saying.

#### PREDICTION OF HIGHER COSTS

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for about half a minute, to insert an article in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kansas may proceed.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Only yesterday we received a message from the President concerning some proposed changes in the new Defense Production Act. Inasmuch as hearings will be held in the near future on some of the bills introduced for the purpose of making certain changes, it is well for us to consider what some of the predictions—more properly designated as "prophecies"—will develop into, especially what effect many of these statements will have on the predicted higher costs.

In that connection I believe it would be helpful to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article published in the Wall Street Journal of August 24, 1951. The article is entitled, "How a Government Guess Becomes a Solemn Prediction of Higher Costs," and was written by W. C. Bryant. I commend it for reading by all Members of the Senate.

ECONOMIC PROPHECIES—HOW A GOVERNMENT GUESS BECOMES A SOLEMN PREDICTION OF HIGHER COSTS

(By W. C. Bryant)

WASHINGTON.—That frightening figure—\$16,000,000,000 worth of rising prices—which the administration has conjured up to scare Congress into revising its price-control law seems to have been put together from casual guesses and cast-off computations.

At any rate, it is difficult to discover any real substance in its makeup. It would probably have languished, unheralded and unsung, had not the mobilizer-in-chief, Charles E. Wilson, stumbled upon it, adopted it as his foster child, and built it up into a first-class bogeyman.

As it is, the \$16,000,000,000 figure is being used as an official measure of how much living costs will rise over the next year as a result of the inadequate price-control law passed by Congress. Mr. Wilson and others have already used it to try to frighten Congress into remorse. President Truman used

the threat of sharp price increases again yesterday in his special message asking Congress to reconsider and enact an adequate control law.

So Congress ought to be interested in how this \$16,000,000,000 bogeyman came into being. The Senators especially might want to consider its origin before they follow the example of the House and vote Mr. Wilson's office \$500,000 for an educational program—a campaign according to him, to get the public better informed about the facts of mobilization.

#### AN INNOCENT BEGINNING

This alarming forecast on future prices had an innocent beginning.

Price boss Mike DiSalle hankered to know how changes in the control law would affect his work. He told economists in the Office of Price Stabilization to figure it out and let him know. They produced a long memo analyzing the effect the new law would have on price ceilings. They concluded a good many would have to be raised. No surprise in that, since Congress obviously intended higher price ceilings, when it provided more liberal allowances for increased costs and distributors' mark-ups.

To their credit, the OPS men didn't try to make any grand generalization. They pored over lots of price orders and tried to guess how much various ceilings would go up to conform with the new law.

At that point, the bogeyman began to take shape.

Price controllers have to assume—however shaky the assumption—that, when price ceilings go up, prices go up. If businessmen sell for less than the Government says they can charge, then the time has come for the controllers to pack up and go home. Controllers are rather reluctant to come to that conclusion.

So the OPS memo was looked on in official circles as a forecast of higher prices. In that context, it reached the desk of the Economic Stabilizer, Eric Johnston.

His interests are broader than Mr. DiSalle's. By virtue of his loftier position, Mr. Johnston is less concerned with the multitude of individual price orders, and more interested in the general level of prices. So, he was curious about the over-all result.

#### PULLED OUT OF THIN AIR

The OPS memo didn't tell him what that would be, and apparently the economists he consulted were of the opinion that no reliable forecast could be made. At any rate the pundits around Messrs. DiSalle and Johnston disclaim any knowledge of the generalizations later used. No documents suggesting them ever crossed their desks, these gentlemen assert.

Perhaps Mr. Johnston merely reached into thin air for the answer he gave at a White House meeting one day, when he was asked how much prices would go up. Mr. Johnston's aides say his reply went something like this:

"Nobody knows how much prices will go up. The ESA and OPS can't even determine what effect the new law will have on price ceilings. Studies indicate that there will be little or no effect in some areas. At the other extreme, price ceilings might go up 15 percent."

"You can guess the increases would average 5 to 8 percent, and one man's guess is as good as another's," Mr. Johnston is supposed to have said.

At least one Cabinet member left the meeting with the impression that Mr. Johnston predicted a 5- to 8-percent increase. In the account which this official gave reporters, anonymously, the \$16,000,000,000 figure first appeared.

This was a bit of a rapid calculation, based on an 8-percent increase in prices paid by consumers. The Government figures consumer expenditures are running around \$200

000,000,000 a year. If prices go up 1 percent and consumers go on buying the same volume of goods, there'll be an increase of \$2,000,000,000 in consumer expenditures. An 8-percent rise would mean a \$16,000,000,000 increase.

Two things should be noted about the origin of this \$16,000,000,000 forecast. Apparently Mr. Johnston did not pretend the figure on which it was based was reliable. And even if prices went up as much as he suggested, consumer expenditures needn't go up the same amount. Consumers might stop buying some of the higher-priced products. They often do.

#### MR. WILSON MAKES IT SOUND AUTHENTIC

Up to this point, the bogeyman was merely a Cabinet member's garbled report. It remained for Mr. Wilson to give it an official stamp. In a speech on August 15 at Evanston, Ill., he informed his audience solemnly:

"As a public servant, I must do my best to follow the orders of Congress, but I would be remiss if I did not make plain some of the difficulties that are involved in administering the terms of the new Defense Production Act. I must tell you, for example, that it is likely to increase the cost of living. One estimate is that this increase will be from 5 to 8 percent. Each percentage point of increase means an added cost of \$2,000,000,000 to the people. In other words, there might be an increase in living costs ranging from \$10,000,000,000 to \$16,000,000,000—and, by the same token, the defense mobilization program would become more costly."

No doubt many who heard or read his statement accepted the \$16,000,000,000 figure as careful calculation. Nowadays, the public looks to the Government for a steady stream of statistics that are commonly thought to be as truthful and as accurate as modern mathematicians can make them.

Mr. Wilson now proposes to spend half a million dollars making more facts available to the public. He told the House Appropriations Committee that he wouldn't like anyone to get his proposed "educational program" confused with propaganda.

Considering the way Mr. Johnston's wild guess was used, the Senate Appropriations Committee ought to give some thought to where one draws the line between fact and propaganda.

#### STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 4, line 6.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished minority leader, in order to expedite consideration of the pending bill, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of debate of 1 hour on the committee amendment on the Voice of America and 30 minutes, or 15 minutes on each side, on all other amendments, including any amendment to the amendment with respect to the Voice of America; that the time be divided between the proponents of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], provided he is against the amendment; and if he is for the amendment, the time to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader or



some Senator designated by him; and that on the committee amendment with respect to the Voice of America the time be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and my colleague [Mr. HAYDEN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Arizona, the majority leader, to suggest 15 minutes to a side on each amendment except the Voice of America amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct; and an hour on the Voice of America amendment, or 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. McCARRAN. I respectfully suggest 20 minutes to a side on each amendment save and except the Voice of America amendment. So far as I am concerned, 20 minutes would be sufficient on that amendment, but I understand that other Senators wish to speak on the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I modify my unanimous-consent request to make it 40 minutes on all amendments except the amendment with respect to the Voice of America, and an hour on that amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator mean 20 minutes to a side?

Mr. McFARLAND. Twenty minutes to a side; and 30 minutes to a side on the Voice of America amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the time allotted for debate on the Voice of America amendment is to be 1 hour, or 30 minutes to each side.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think that may be inadequate. I do not know how many of my colleagues will wish to speak on the subject, but I believe that a number of us will wish to speak. I request that the time be increased from 1 hour to an hour and a half, or 45 minutes to each side.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will make that modification—an hour and a half on the committee amendment with respect to the Voice of America, or 45 minutes to a side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona is now addressing himself to the Voice of America amendment, is he not?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not know whether objection will be made to the request or not. I took it up with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is the manager of the bill on this side of the aisle, and I think the request is agreeable to him. What the majority leader has suggested, if we understand him correctly, is that, with respect to the committee amendment, as it came from the committee, making an appropriation for the Voice of America of \$62,000,000, there shall be debate of half in all; 45 minutes to a side.

Mr. McFARLAND. An hour and a half in all; 45 minutes to a side.

Mr. WHERRY. Forty-five minutes to a side.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. WHERRY. And with respect to any amendment to that amendment—if a cut or an increase is proposed—the same time is to be allowed as will be allowed on any other amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I had not contacted all the Members on this side of the aisle. I discussed the question with the Senator from Michigan. I see the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is on his feet. As I have stated, I discussed the question with the Senator from Michigan and other members of the Appropriations Committee, and I am satisfied that the suggested arrangement is acceptable to them.

If no objection is made, I must do something about the request which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] made 3 days ago for 30 minutes on Friday morning. He is not in the Chamber at the moment. I shall try to arrive at a satisfactory arrangement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from North Dakota withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. LANGER. I will object, anyway, but I am glad to withhold my objection for a moment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I point out to my distinguished friend from North Dakota that the majority leader indicated to us last night that it is categorically imperative to finish this bill this week, because we have set a goal of October 1 for sine die adjournment. Next week we plan to consider the foreign-aid bill. The following week we plan to consider the military-appropriation bill. The week after that we plan to consider the tax bill, which will carry us up to the middle of September and leave two more weeks for agreement on many conference reports, which cannot be acted upon until the House returns on September 12.

If we do not have a limitation of debate on this bill, it will mean that we shall be here tonight until 12 o'clock, and perhaps until Saturday morning. Certainly the distinguished Senator from North Dakota cannot see any real good in holding us here that long. I am sure that he does not want to speak for 2 or 3 hours on any of these subjects, and I hope no other Senator does.

I plan to speak for about 10 minutes on the Voice of America, but not because I think it will change any votes. I do not believe that any speeches will be made here today which will change votes. I believe that every Senator knows pretty well what is involved, and how he intends to vote. The thing for the Senate to do is to expedite the business before it. I hope that my distinguished friend from

North Dakota will withdraw his objection and let us proceed under a plan which gives promise of efficient action by this greatest of all legislative bodies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Chair correctly understand the Senator from North Dakota to object to the request?

Mr. LANGER. I object. I do not see any reason why we should have to adjourn by the 1st of October. We receive our pay for October, November, and December. I do not see any reason for any limitation, and I object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the majority leader to the fact that there are now two amendments pending to the Voice of America item. If we permit debate of an hour and a half on each amendment—

Mr. McFARLAND. If my friend from Nevada will yield, I should like to say that my request was that debate on the committee amendment with reference to the Voice of America be limited to an hour and a half, but as to any other amendments the time would be limited to 40 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that one of the amendments would merely restore the House language. It is not necessary to offer an amendment in order to accomplish that. It would be necessary only to vote on the committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest that we could have a quorum call. Perhaps we may be able to work out an agreement during the call for a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCARRAN. I want a quorum call, and I do not want a synthetic quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The Chief Clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is on the floor, and he wishes to make some remarks on a subject matter other than the pending bill. I believe it would help the situation if he could proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. In that case I have no objection. However, after the Senator from Indiana has concluded his remarks I shall insist on a quorum call.



Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator from Nevada so far as the pending bill is concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on January 22, 1951, the State Department sent John Foster Dulles as its emissary to Japan to negotiate a peace treaty. Mr. Dulles found the usual apparent obstruction by the Communists and by Great Britain, but he flitted about like a dusty moth and came up with "settlements" of all the problems that vexed him or the State Department.

Now the final draft treaty is ready, and it is to be formally signed September 4, or thereabouts, at San Francisco in a conference of nations very like that in which the United Nations was born.

This plan is moving with exquisite smoothness. Not the faintest sound of friction is heard as it slides down the ways. Soon the treaty will be finally launched and will sail off into the future without any chance to change the design which its sponsors laid down for it.

I say, Mr. President, that this proposed Japanese peace treaty is a fraud. It is a booby trap. It is a repetition of the "Marshall plan" for subversion of China which General Marshall took to Chungking in December 1945.

This draft treaty is a subtle, devious plan to destroy what is left of our policy and our security in the Pacific by the same bold, clever trick of removing the beams supporting the free countries of Asia and letting them fall without letting it appear that we pulled them down.

The draft treaty proposes that Japan is to be restored to full independence, without any restrictions on her military, political, or economic policies. That is all very well. But we have learned to our sorrow how the State Department uses the loveliest words and the most seductive arguments when it is offering the most questionable proposals.

It is all very well to set Japan "free," but we must be sure it is not like setting a young maiden free in a wood full of bloodthirsty bandits.

We must not set Japan free on terms which mean she will promptly fall into a trap carefully contrived by Communist Russia and her Chinese stooges.

Of course, this treaty is hailed by the administration as a glorious victory. It is peace in our time all over again. So subtly is this blueprint constructed, so smooth is the surface, that the whole burden of proof falls on its opponents to make clear why it is a mortal threat to our national survival.

My objections to the Japanese treaty draft can be put briefly. They are:

First. It validates the Yalta pact by giving the U. S. S. R. permanent title to southern Sakhalin and the Kuriles.

Second. It breaks the island chain of our defense in the Pacific, because the Kuriles are a link between the Aleutians and Japan. Used as a base, these islands give the Soviet union a break-through to the far Pacific island chain, on which our security rests.

Third. And this is astonishing—the treaty ignores free China. The State Department has invited 50 nations to participate, but has ignominiously left out free China, which fought Japan for 9 years before Pearl Harbor and all through World War II. Just think of that, Mr. President.

Fourth. The draft proposes that United Nations troops may be stationed in Japan. But who are the UN? After the so-called peace treaty has been agreed on in Korea and the climate of public opinion is prepared by propaganda, what is to prevent the Soviet Union from offering a sizable complement of Russian troops to "help" the UN in Japan? What could we do to stop this clever attempt to outflank Formosa?

Fifth. Japan is to be given complete "self-determination" to make whatever treaties she likes for political and economic purposes.

Japan's ability to support her overpopulation depends on her trade, which in the past was largely with China.

We step out, and Japan resumes her trade with Red China and entwines her economy with the Communists. Meanwhile, the fifth column in Japan carries on its political subversion.

How long will it be before Japan "freely" votes herself into the Soviet world Government? If she does not fall into the trap of her own free will, how long will it be before the economic squeeze or a military uprising, under the fifth column, forces her to go the way of China?

In mid-May I made a public statement quoting the formal peace terms placed by the Soviet Union before the UN Assembly on December 9, 1950. In that statement I pointed out the Soviet demands were compressed into two simple-appearing proposals, which I now quote:

First. That all foreign troops be withdrawn from Korea.

Second. That the decision on the Korean question be entrusted to the Korean people themselves.

I pointed out at that time these demands constituted a brilliant strategic plan applicable to every country in the Far East. They gave the Soviet Union everything it could possibly desire in Asia. This new plan, or adaptation of an old plan, was devised by the Soviet strategists, when they found they could not push us—as planned—off the Korean Peninsula, because our fire power, even with all our political handicaps, was strong enough to overcome the advantages of their manpower.

Point 1 was designed to win withdrawal of all American forces in Asia, so that the small, defenseless nations of Asia could not protect themselves, and we could not help them train or equip armies of their own nationals.

Point 2 was designed to leave a free field for fifth columns and subversion from within. Once American troops were withdrawn, the fifth columns would be free to engage in political and military sabotage. Strikes and other economic sabotage could go on unhindered and could drain away the resources of their victims. When the time was ripe, the Soviet armies could strike, or, even more Machiavellian, the helpless Asian

nations could be forced to vote themselves into the Soviet world government, and all Asia would be conquered without the firing of a shot.

Mr. President, the "self-determination of small nations" is a good principle, and one that has a special appeal to Americans; but the self-determination of South Korea, Formosa, Japan, or the Philippines would not be worth a continental against the new political warfare and the armed might of the Soviet Union.

This Soviet strategy is, in essentials, the pattern of General Marshall's 1945 solution in Asia. We were to withdraw our forces and leave all political questions to peaceful solution by the Chinese themselves. We did withdraw our forces and withhold our arms. We demobilized the Chinese armies, but the Soviet Union armed the Communists and encouraged the fifth column. The Reds tore up the railroads and stopped all economic recovery. Then, when we were deeply engaged in a Presidential election, the Communists gave orders for the final assault.

Mr. President, if you look closely you will see that the same two principles, withdraw foreign troops and leave political questions to self-determination, again underlie every step of the peace negotiations in Korea.

After our forces leave, the Communists in Korea will be rearmed, the fifth column will be reactivated, the Government of Syngman Rhee will be destroyed by internal sabotage, and, in the turmoil, the Soviet Union will take over. In the meantime, 20,000 American boys will have died, 80,000 will have been crippled and wounded, a million civilians will have died, and the country of our friends and allies, the South Koreans, will have been leveled to rubbish.

I say, the same two principles underlie the Japanese Peace Treaty, and they work to the same end, namely, the collapse of all the independent nations of Asia from within, their incorporation in the Union of Soviet Republics, and the establishment of a ring of Soviet bases from Alaska to Australia, on the island chain which should constitute our defense line against attack.

The immediate crisis in the spread or defeat of this plan for all Asia is the Japanese Peace Treaty. D-day is September 4, only a little over a week away.

Let us see how these two brilliant strategic principles, the military and the political booby traps, apply to the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Mr. Dulles—all Senators know who Mr. Dulles is. I believe he is the man who recommended Alger Hiss for a job on the International Peace Foundation. I believe he is the man who, on the floor of the United States Senate, said that, at a conference in England, they had debated for some time whether they should tell the American people the truth. I think all Senators know Mr. Dulles, the Wall Street lawyer. Mr. Dulles says we shall maintain in Japan forces of the United States and of the United Nations.

But let us remember what the UN is. Like Alice in Wonderland, sometimes it is tall, sometimes it is small. When we



went into the Korean War, the UN had drunk of the bottle which made it small. The vast U. S. S. R. was not represented. But as soon as we were launched so deep in the Korean War that we could not turn back without the onus of defeat, the UN drank of the bottle, which made it grow again.

The U. S. S. R. came back to the fold, and, during most of the Korean War, UN's political policies, the policies under which our men were fighting, and dying, were made by a Council in which the Soviet Union and her satellites were very much in evidence.

Mr. President, you remember the television spectacle of last summer, in which Mr. Malik and the agents of Red China, speaking in the United Nations, descended to depths of vituperation against the United States, while their troops were killing our men and our Korean allies.

If we sign this Japanese treaty at San Francisco, permitting the same UN to station troops in Japan, how long will it be before the U. S. S. R. discovers that it ought to send a large, well-trained complement of Soviet troops to help the UN protect Japan?

Mr. President, how would you feel, if you were in the Nationalist Government on Formosa, and were told that the American occupation was to come to an end, and that Japan was to be left to the tender mercies of the Soviet fifth column, Soviet troops in Japan, and a few American and other forces nicely entangled in the spider web of UN? How would you feel? If that is not a classic instance of military outflanking, what is it?

There are 8,000,000 people on Formosa and 80,000,000 people in Japan. If the Japanese can be sovietized in a few months by political, economic, or military means, what is the life expectancy of free China? Could Von Clausewitz have planned its military destruction more perfectly?

The military booby trap under the deceptive phrases of the peace treaty is now clear. The economic booby trap under those deceptive phrases is equally clear and equally simple.

The economic pitfall in the treaty is the fair-sounding condition that no barriers must be placed on the complete freedom of Japan to earn a living for her people. That is the self-determination clause of the Soviet peace terms all over again. Japan has had a surplus population for generations. She cannot support her excessive population on the arable land of her own islands. For generations she has supported them by exporting her labor at cut prices on the world market, and by acquiring more land and raw materials on the mainland, in Korea and Manchuria.

Japan's population problem is still acute. It has risen under our beneficent rule. The problem has been met in part, during the past 6 years, by American contributions for the government and relief of occupied areas. Once the peace treaty is ratified, Japan will suddenly be faced with an economic crisis. She needs materials from Manchuria, she needs market outlets in continental

China. What can she do but make a commercial treaty with Red China, which controls the raw materials and the markets which her hungry people must have if they are not to die of starvation?

Mr. Vincente Villamin, Washington columnist for the Manila Bulletin, has told us exactly what will happen. He says:

The draft treaty gives Japan the right to choose which China to negotiate her treaty of peace with.

It is generally expected that she will choose Communist China—for she wants to revive her trade with that country.

Those countries which have recognized Communist China would want Japan to deal with her.

That action would virtually mean (1) recognition of the Communist Government, (2) acquiescence of the signers of the general treaty to the position of Communist China as legalized by Japan, and (3) enhanced prestige and popularity for Communist China which would serve her well when the General Assembly of the United Nations decides which China should be recognized in that world government.

In other words, the action of Japan is bound to have the tremendous actual and psychological effects of putting Communist China forward as the legitimate government of China, and that would be the beginning of the end of Nationalist China.

Maybe you believe, Mr. President, that a plan of which the pieces fit together so perfectly, which is so skillfully designed to achieve the Soviet purpose, happened by pure accident. But I do not.

Maybe you believe, Mr. President, that every step in our State Department's peace plan for Japan fitted this Soviet design, but no one in the State Department was in collusion with the Soviet leaders: I do not believe it, Mr. President.

Maybe you believe, Mr. President, that our State Department sanctions a treaty which will force Japan to trade with Red China, but it does not intend to surrender Formosa to the Reds after the other powers vote them into the UN.

Others may believe it, Mr. President, but I do not.

It is very difficult to understand the silence of our press, our Members of Congress, and our people, in the face of this sell-out to Russia, so soon after the loss of the Chinese mainland. But it is equally impossible to understand the silence over the new humiliation of our ally, free China.

Burma is invited to sign the new treaty, Mr. President; so are Ceylon and Indonesia, and the USSR, after 7 days of war with Japan. But free China, which fought against Japanese invasion for 13 years, is not worthy of an invitation.

It is a shameful fact that the only protest against the needless, inexcusable humiliation of free China comes from the Chinese themselves.

Dr. Hu Shih, distinguished former Ambassador from China, protested bitterly against the fact his country was offered this last cruel, gratuitous insult.

The Chinese people are deeply aroused. Young Chinese officers are committing suicide to escape the shame, but, as usual, nothing can be heard above the din of propaganda from our Government.

The Formosa government has pointed out that the draft treaty is not only contrary to international justice and honor but a specific violation of the UN Charter, and the first declaration of the United Nations, signed January 1, 1942, in which the signers agreed "not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies."

The British, like the U. S. S. R., demanded that the Peiping government be invited in place of free China which had fought for 13 years against Japan. Mr. Dulles flew to England and then announced his great victory—England was willing that neither free China nor Red China be invited.

Perhaps some people believe, Mr. President, that the British Socialist Government and Mr. Dulles accidentally hit upon the "compromise," which was exactly what the Soviet Union wanted, but I, Mr. President, do not.

Perhaps some people believe, Mr. President, that leaving free China out of the signatories of the Japanese peace treaty will help American prestige in Asia, but I do not. In fact, I think that, like so many acts of our State Department, it is perfectly designed to make our allies doubt whether they can any longer trust our country.

Of course, the Soviet Union has opposed the Dulles plan for peace in Japan. But they know that opposing it is the best way to get the program through without critical examination by our people.

The Soviet Union always has a trained chorus voicing opposition to every program our people work out for America.

The U. S. S. R.'s formal protests do show us, however, the strategic principles in which their policy always rests:

Keep the Yalta agreement.

Leave all the decisions to the five-power Council of Foreign Ministers set up at Potsdam, which means no unilateral action by the United States free from the Soviet veto power.

Recognize Red China.

Get the occupation troops out of Japan within a definite time and permit no American military base there.

They may gain their objectives quickly or they may work slowly, but the Communists will never compromise.

See how their proposals for Japan really fit the treaty.

First, Admit Japan to the UN.

Second, Obey the injunction in the Yalta and Potsdam agreements to eliminate "all obstacles to resurrection and strengthening of democratic tendencies among Japanese people" and open up "broad possibilities for development of peaceful economy."

Third, Remove all limitations with respect to trade of Japan with other states.

Fourth, All occupation troops will be withdrawn from Japan territory in course of not more than 1 year, and no foreign state will have troops or military bases in Japan.

The Soviet leaders do not want to stop this treaty. The present talk is merely a distraction to turn the attention of the American people away from the fact that the Japanese draft treaty gives the Soviet Union everything it could possibly desire.



cloak of congressional immunity, but that an individual has no opportunity to defend himself. This gives the right of self-defense and the forum for defense. Knowing that this right and this forum exists, and that the charges will be answered, I believe that Members of Congress will be more careful about attacking innocent people on the floor.

Now, as to the other resolution, establishing a code of conduct for committee investigations. It is of necessity more detailed. In it, however, I have tried to meet the criticisms of some congressional committee practices, of which there are many, ranging from Walter Lippmann's characterization of congressional investigations as "that legalized atrocity where Congressmen, starved of their legitimate food for thought, go on a wild and feverish manhunt, and do not stop at cannibalism." The criticism of investigative committees, I believe, has centered around the following points, however:

(a) Congressional investigations frequently assume the aspects of a trial of an individual without safeguards of regular court proceedings.

(b) Legislators appear in the role of judges and combine the functions of prosecuting and judging, which should be separated.

(c) The witnesses may be exposed to such penalties as loss of their jobs, character assassination, or injury to their reputation as a result of the attendant publicity.

(d) Appearances before investigative committees are not subject to procedures laid down by Congress.

(e) Legal rights of individuals guaranteed by the Bill of Rights are abridged by congressional investigations. Another objection, somewhat intangible but of great danger to a democracy, is the fact that conformity to prevailing ideas is enforced by fear of censure before a congressional committee. In this connection the question is raised whether some investigations do not impose "tyranny of the prevailing opinion and feeling" which John Stuart Mill once described as "tendency of society to impose, by other means than civil penalties, its own ideas and practices as rules of conduct on those who dissent from them."

As a result of resentment against methods employed by certain investigating committees, the committee on the Bill of Rights of the Bar Association of New York City made a study of the subject. In its December 1948 report, which was adopted by the association, the committee found that most complaints centered on the belief that inquiry into witnesses' personal affairs violated "some right of the individual to immunity from official inquisition or some right in the nature of a 'right of privacy.'" The bar association committee felt that some of the conditions complained of are inherent in the conduct of the legislative process or are due to the shortcomings of particular individuals concerned in making the investigation. Much of the criticism, however, the committee considered justified and it felt that certain rules could be

adopted which would insure to a much greater degree the observance of ordinary principles of fairness and justice.

There have been several attempts, beginning in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to prescribe procedures of investigating committees and to protect the rights of witnesses. Several resolutions have been submitted both in the House and in the Senate providing for an investigation of the conduct of investigations by committees. Senator Lucas submitted resolutions in both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congress for reform of committee procedures. Testifying before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration which held hearings on his resolution in July of 1949, Senator Lucas said he was shocked that no code of conduct governed the committees. He cited methods employed by the Joint Committee To Investigate the Pearl Harbor Disaster and the Howard Hughes fiasco of the Senate War Investigating Committee.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] also addressed the Senate on the defects of the Senate investigating procedures, urging careful review of present procedures and protective reforms.

There have been many proposals made for reforms in the conduct of congressional investigations. Some of these included the delegation of certain types of inquiries to various outside agencies and a ban on the creation of special investigating committees of Congress.

Several keen students of the problem have recommended the delegation of certain types of inquiries to bodies outside of Congress. Regardless of the merits of such arguments and the numerous precedents cited for congressional delegation of the investigative function, it is clear that Congress would not abdicate its responsibility. Congress is too zealous of its power and prerogatives to consider seriously his new approach to the problem.

While I would support a resolution limiting special committees, such a ban on special committees is no solution to the problem. In my opinion, this would have no effect on minimizing abuses, assuring fairness of investigations or protecting witnesses.

Another proposed reform is the voluntary adoption of self-imposed rules by individual committees to guide their conduct. Such measures have been taken by certain committees, namely, the Procurement and Buildings Subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments under chairmanship of Representative GEORGE BENDER of the Eightieth Congress, the Investigations Subcommittee of the Senate Executive Expenditures Subcommittee of which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was chairman, and the watchdog subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee of which the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is chairman, and many others.

Those chairmen are to be commended for their vision and their pioneering in the field of committee reform. How-

ever, it seems evident to me that rules imposed by individual committees themselves, while a step in the right direction, are not the final answer. No halfway measure should stand in the way of congressional action establishing rules for proper procedure for all committees.

A code of fair conduct for all investigating groups—adopted by House and Senate as part of their standing rules—would have the effect of avoiding confusion and promoting uniformity. It would give Congress and the country a yardstick by which to test the performance of every committee investigation. A code of procedure for administrative agencies has been established. Why not a code for congressional committees?

I think this code is workable. All its elements can be found in the best practices of the most successful and most respected investigating committees.

Briefly, this is what the resolution provides:

First. That a person or organization shall be notified, if possible, of the nature of the charges against him, of the matters to be inquired into, and of the derogatory material to be presented.

Second. That he be given an opportunity to present evidence in his own behalf.

Third. That he be permitted counsel, who shall be entitled to question him within appropriate limits in order to bring out all pertinent facts.

Fourth. That he be permitted to file a limited number of interrogatories to be answered by witnesses who have testified to derogatory materials.

Fifth. That he be permitted to file at the conclusion of the evidence a rebuttal statement.

There are also outlined safeguards regarding subpoenas, safeguards for information developed in executive session, safeguards for the private affairs of individuals—and I think I should expound a bit on how television has been treated.

In this resolution, we have television, which is a new method of communication but one that is here to stay and with which we shall have to deal, just like any other method of communication. In other words, these same rules would apply, whether the hearing is conducted in executive session, covered only by the press, or covered by the press, still-camera men, radio, newsreels, television, and so on. But we have placed in this code the responsibility upon the chairman of the committee to see to it that none of the communication devices annoy the witness. If the chairman decides they do, then it is his responsibility to see that the annoyance is ceased, or if the hearing room is not suitable for television, or other media of communication, the chairman will continue to have full authority not to allow it.

Therefore, the code set up under this resolution does not force television upon any committee. If the committee chairman determines that televising is hindering the work of the committee, then it is his responsibility and his duty to stop the cameras.

In conclusion may I repeat that I do not claim for these resolutions any finality of draftsmanship. These are simply



problems that have worried many of us and these are the best solutions that a number of us, thinking and working together, could produce as a starting point. Undoubtedly, there will be many more ideas on the subjects—and we will welcome them all as these resolutions pass through committee and floor consideration. But I want to end, as I began, with a plea that as we do consider them, we keep partisanship out of it. These are matters regarding things that are very fundamental in the lives of our citizens and our country—and there is no place for partisanship as we tackle these fundamental matters.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the distinguished Senator ask that the resolutions be appropriately referred, or did he ask that they be referred to some special committee?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I simply asked for their appropriate reference.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am advised they have been referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, last night, at a conference of the majority, it was unanimously agreed that the Senate should remain in continuous session until we conclude action on the unfinished business which is the appropriation bill. We have already lost today, so far as the bill is concerned, more than 2 hours. I hope Senators will not blame me if the Senate will be obliged to remain in session 2 hours longer than it otherwise would have to be in session. I am not responsible for that. I hope we may proceed to the consideration of the bill and finish it. I shall regret very much to have to see the Senate remain in session all night long.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 4, line 6, in lieu of "\$74,487,777" proposed by the committee amendment to insert "\$70,000,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I promised the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that I would ask for a quorum call before we proceeded to the consideration of his amendment. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|               |          |           |
|---------------|----------|-----------|
| Alken         | Clements | Ellender  |
| Benton        | Connally | Ferguson  |
| Bricker       | Cordon   | Frear     |
| Butler, Md.   | Dirksen  | Fulbright |
| Butler, Nebr. | Douglas  | George    |
| Byrd          | Duff     | Gillette  |
| Carlson       | Dworshak | Green     |
| Case          | Eaton    | Hayden    |

|                |           |              |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|
| Hendrickson    | Lodge     | Pastore      |
| Hennings       | Long      | Robertson    |
| Hickenlooper   | Magnuson  | Russell      |
| Hill           | Malone    | Saltonstall  |
| Hoey           | Martin    | Schoeppel    |
| Holland        | Maybank   | Smathers     |
| Hunt           | McCarran  | Smith, Maine |
| Ives           | McClellan | Smith, N. C. |
| Jenner         | McFarland | Sparkman     |
| Johnson, Colo. | McKellar  | Stennis      |
| Johnson, Tex.  | McMahon   | Thye         |
| Kefauver       | Millikin  | Underwood    |
| Kerr           | Moody     | Watkins      |
| Kilgore        | Morse     | Welker       |
| Knowland       | Mundt     | Wherry       |
| Langer         | Murray    | Wiley        |
| Lehman         | Neely     | Williams     |
|                | Nixon     | Young        |

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent from the Senate today attending the funeral of a relative in New York.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of a death in his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 4, line 6.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I renew the unanimous-consent request which I made a short time ago. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending bill be limited, as follows: That debate be limited to an hour and a half on the committee amendment dealing with the Voice of America; that with respect to all other amendments, including amendments to the committee amendment dealing with the Voice of America, debate be limited to 40 minutes, 20 minutes to each side, the time to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], provided he is opposed to the amendment; and in the event he is in favor of the amendment, the time to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader; provided further, that the time for de-

bate on the committee amendment dealing with the Voice of America be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BENTON. I should like to ask for some clarification of the proposed agreement. Am I to understand that no time would be available after an hour and a half of discussion, but that there would be general debate on the Voice of America for an hour and a half, following which amendments would be taken up and voted upon?

Mr. McFARLAND. Debate on the committee amendment dealing with the Voice of America would be limited to an hour and a half. That is the only exception to the rule limiting debate to 40 minutes on each amendment.

Mr. BENTON. Would the majority leader explain the effect of a vote on what he calls other amendments to this committee amendment? Suppose the Senate votes to support the committee amendment, what would be the effect?

Mr. McFARLAND. If the committee amendment is agreed to, it is not then subject to amendment.

Any amendment desired to be offered by a Senator should be proposed before a vote is taken on the committee amendment. Any such amendment would be subject to the limitation of debate applicable to individual amendments, namely, 40 minutes, with 20 minutes to the side.

Mr. BENTON. Because of word I had from the Parliamentarian this morning, Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader if he would amend his request so that an hour and a half would be available for general debate, following which an amendment could be submitted and a vote could be had on the amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. If an amendment is offered it would naturally be subject to a limitation of 40 minutes of debate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Suppose we utilize the hour and a half for general discussion and a vote is taken on the committee amendment at that time, and the committee amendment is agreed to. Then what?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield before he answers that question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If an amendment is offered to the committee amendment, it would be offered before the committee amendment is voted upon. Therefore, all amendments subject to a limitation of 40 minutes would be out of the way before the committee would be considered.

Mr. BENTON. At the end of an hour and a half?

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. It will amount to more than an hour and a half, if the time is figured.



Mr. McFARLAND. That may be. We must do the best we can. The result of the vote on the committee amendment might be such that an amendment could be offered. I will not pass on that question at this time. We can pass on it when we get to it. However, if an amendment is offered to the committee amendment before the committee amendment is voted upon, as suggested by the distinguished minority leader, whoever offers the amendment would control the time in favor of it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I did not hear the statement of the whole unanimous consent agreement. Is there any difference between the unanimous-consent request made now with respect to the committee amendment dealing with the Voice of America and the request which was made earlier today, with reference to the distribution of time for debate?

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Who would control the time in opposition?

Mr. McFARLAND. On the committee amendment dealing with the Voice of America the time in opposition would be controlled by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. WHERRY. There is a difference, then, because my understanding was that the time in opposition would be controlled by the junior Senator from Nebraska. Consequently, I have already allocated several minutes to Senators, in order to get agreement to the unanimous consent request. I am sure that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] would let me have some time, but I would prefer, if the majority leader does not object—it is purely a mechanical matter—that some of the time in opposition to the committee amendment under discussion be assigned either to the junior Senator from Nebraska or to the senior Senator from South Dakota. It is merely a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. McCARRAN. My understanding is that of the hour and a half I am to control 45 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. My only reason for assigning the time in the way I have was because in committee the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was opposed to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] on this issue.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] will not need all his time.

Mr. WHERRY. On previous occasions the situation was handled in this way. Because most of the amendments which are to be offered would have the effect of raising the amount, to which the Senator from Nevada would be opposed, I would suggest that either the junior Senator from Nebraska or the senior Senator from South Dakota should control the time in opposition.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order to bring the agreement into effect, and in order that every Senator may have an opportunity to speak on the subject, I amend the request to provide that 22½ minutes be controlled by the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr.

MUNDT] and 22½ minutes by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. And that the time for debate on the bill itself be limited to 40 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that mean 40 minutes to each side?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; 20 minutes to each side. Of course, the agreement would cover all amendments, motions, and appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader?

Mr. McMAHON. Reserving the right to object, do I understand that there is to be a special rule with respect to the Voice of America amendment permitting 45 minutes of debate on each side?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Many times in the past when I agreed to such unanimous-consent agreements, I regretted my action later. I hope I will not regret my agreement to this one. We are dealing with a very important piece of legislation. I should like to have some guaranty that if I go along with the agreement, I will not be shut out. I should like to have about 6 minutes to speak on the subject.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is why I reserved half the time in opposition to the amendment to the senior Senator from Arizona, and half the time to the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I do not think that my colleague understood the earlier colloquy, by which 20 minutes is allowed for debate on each side on any amendment that may be offered to the amendment dealing with the Voice of America. It means that there will be more than an hour and a half available for a discussion of the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say for the record that the same point was raised by the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] earlier today. That was his only reason for feeling that no limitation of time should be imposed. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota understands that many Senators would be inconvenienced if the Senate did not finish consideration of the bill as quickly as possible, with all due deliberation, and he very reluctantly, but I believe very cooperatively, has decided to withdraw his objection, for the same reason that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut now withholds his objection. There may be regrets later, but at the same time both Senators have agreed not to object. I want the record to show that fact, and I am sure the Senate appreciates it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I fully concur in the remarks of the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] that this is such an important question that every Senator who wants to speak on it should

have an opportunity to do so. The point has been made by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] that an amendment may be offered to the committee amendment dealing with the Voice of America, thus giving an opportunity to debate the subject for an additional 40 minutes on each amendment.

In the event that an amendment is offered to the committee amendment, would it be considered as an amendment in the second degree or as an amendment in the third degree? In other words, I wish to make sure that a point of order will not be made against such an amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, Mr. President, an amendment to the amendment would be in the second degree.

Mr. President, I hope there will be no objection to the proposed agreement. I wish to say that I do not think any Senator by speaking will change one vote on this proposition. If Senators talk at undue length, they will do so only for their own satisfaction.

So, I hope there will not be any objection to the proposed agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). Without objection, the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Arizona is agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered is submitted to the committee amendment on page 4, in line 6. If my amendment to that committee amendment is agreed to, the ordinary expenses of the Department of State will be reduced from approximately \$74,500,000 to \$70,000,000, or a saving of \$4,500,000.

Mr. President, I do not think all of us fully realize the degree to which the personnel of the State Department has expanded in the past 10 years. In the year 1942 there were 6,476 full-time employees in the State Department. In the year 1951 there were 22,978 positions in that Department. The budget submitted to us by the State Department, which since then has been reduced, called for a total of 27,907 positions, or an increase since 1942 of between four and five times.

I know there will be discussion in regard to the informational and educational activities of the State Department. Those activities constitute a new function which has developed. A certain portion of the increase in the number of employees in the State Department is caused by the expansion of that activity, which formerly was not carried on.

However, the staff used for the ordinary functions of the State Department shows an increase from 6,142 persons in 1942, to 13,773 persons in 1951, or more than double the former number.

I do not wish to cast any reflection upon the character or educational background of those who work in the State Department. I certainly do not like to have unsubstantiated attacks made upon the character of anyone. However, I do not think a proper resentment on that score should blind us to the fact that some of the Government departments are grossly overstaffed.



In other words, in this particular case I do not think the State Department's employees should weep on our shoulders, so to speak, with the statement that they have been grossly abused, and then should make that claimed abuse as an excuse for maintaining an over-staffed Department of State, which, in fact, is the case.

Mr. President, I have not been in Washington a great many years. A majority of the Members of the Senate have been in Washington for a much longer period of time than I have been. They probably know better than I do the conditions existing in the State Department. However, I am sufficiently familiar with the conditions existing in that Department to know that one of the great barriers to efficiency there is the overstaffing which exists. When that Department wishes to deal with a certain problem, it hires an entire platoon, company, battalion, or regiment of experts—with the word "experts" in quotation marks—and then all the experts have to talk to each other and have to circulate memoranda between each other, both vertically, horizontally, and transversely. In this case we have an illustration of an old law that if the number of persons is doubled, the complications are quadrupled. If in addition to A, B is employed to serve with him then there is one contact; but if, in addition, C and D are also employed, then A will have to begin to talk to B, to C, to D; B will also have to talk to C and D; and C and D will have to talk to each other. Immediately there are six conversations, in addition to the fact that those four persons can be paired off in threesomes; and under those circumstances I think it will be found that there will be nine conversations.

In other words, we have a State Department law of arithmetic of permutations and combinations. If the number of employees is increased in arithmetical ratio, the number of memoranda and communications is increased in more than a geometrical ratio. Mr. Malthus would have been delighted to take account of this law as it has been developed in the State Department.

The State Department staff has been so greatly increased that the employees of that Department now spend a large amount of their time circulating among each other and talking to each other. They are musclebound and there is too much adipose tissue; and, as I pointed out yesterday, if there is one thing that afflicts them, it is administrative elephantiasis. Mr. President, I am not an expert on tropical diseases, and I do not know what the proper medical remedy for elephantiasis is. However, a good healthy diet will work wonders in reducing overweight; and the way to change an excessive diet to a good healthy diet is to reduce it to reasonable proportions. Certainly if we reduce the number of employees of the State Department to a reasonable number, we shall reduce the inefficiency of the employees of that Department, for then they will not have to spend so much time talking to one another, and they

will have greater efficiency in connection with conducting foreign relations.

We should bear in mind the example of growing cotton. Any cotton farmer knows that if there are too many stalks of cotton, they will sap the strength of each other. That is why the farmer thins it out with a hoe—so that the remaining stalks can grow unhampered. In a like manner, we should apply the hoe to the surplusage of State Department employees.

I am glad that the flat 10-percent reduction has been applied to the State Department. As a general rule, I am not in favor of making a flat 10-percent reduction, because there are some departments or agencies which should not be subjected to as much as a 10-percent reduction; and there are other departments or agencies, of which the State Department is conspicuously one, in which a reduction of more than 10 percent should be made.

Mr. President, we can make a great contribution to the efficiency and economy of the Government by lopping off 6 percent more of the employees of the State Department. Here is a chance for us to save \$4,500,000; and as a result of making that reduction, we shall be able to return a substantial number of the employees of the State Department to more useful occupations, closer to the soil, so to speak; and in that way we can increase the efficiency of the United States Government.

Such a reduction will be a magnificent bargain; and I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will accept this amendment to the committee amendment, in order to carry out still further the good work he has done on the budget for the State Department.

#### INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR LODGE RELATING TO RECALL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech,

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a routine matter?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I like the Senator from Massachusetts so well that I am willing to yield to him in my own time.

Mr. LODGE. It will take only a minute.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my individual views which were submitted to the chairman of the combined Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, which conducted hearings on the issues surrounding the dismissal of General MacArthur.

And, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent in order to take part in conferences in Europe on matters directly involving American national security, to which I have been invited by Hon. David K. E. Bruce, American Ambassador to France, because of experience which I happen to possess as a result of service with the French Army during World War II, and in order to accept an invitation from the French Minister of National Defense to visit elements of the present French Army.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts please

speak louder? None of us can hear him.

Mr. LODGE. I am simply making a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a cable sent to me by Ambassador Bruce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matters submitted by Mr. LODGE are as follows:

#### INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR LODGE SUBMITTED TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMBINED COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AND ARMED SERVICES WHICH CONDUCTED HEARING ON THE ISSUES SURROUNDING THE DISMISSAL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR

Following are my individual conclusions as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations which, sitting jointly with the Committee on Armed Services, conducted hearings on the issues raised by the relief of General MacArthur:

##### I. AS REGARDS GENERAL MACARTHUR

On April 11, the day that General MacArthur's recall was announced, I issued the following statement:

"General MacArthur is a brilliant soldier with a record of service to his country which is unique. Americans will always be grateful to him. It is a great pity that, due in large part to administration bungling and lack of foresight, differences arose which made it clearly impossible for him to continue, but the civil power—even though we lack confidence in those who hold it—must, under our system of government, be supreme over the military. I hope that out of this distressing event will come the clarification of our aims in Korea and the relation of our far-eastern policy to American security as a whole, which is so badly needed today."

This statement still stands. The evidence indicates:

1. That if there had been imagination, vision, and courage at the time of the Korean aggression, the administration would have responded to the mood of unity and dedication which then existed in America and would have developed such overwhelming military strength that effective pressure could have been put on the instigators of the aggression and the conflict between the Executive and General MacArthur would never have occurred. Instead, that mood of unity and dedication was allowed to fritter away.

2. That a fundamental difference of view did, however, develop and exists today.

3. That, leaving out of account the future conduct of the war in Asia, there can be no question but that General MacArthur's administration in Japan should have been continued until the current negotiations regarding a treaty of peace with Japan had been concluded.

##### II. AS REGARDS THE PAST

1. The hearings underlined the now well-known fact that our military victory at the end of World War II was accompanied and immediately followed by tragic miscalculations of such importance as to rob us of many of the fruits of victory. The utter disintegration of our Armed Forces well nigh destroyed the influence for peace which we possessed at the end of hostilities and made possible the colossal expansion of the Soviet Union. To this one mistake can be attributed most of our present-day troubles in the international field.

2. China turned from a land of traditional friendship with America into a bitter and aggressive Communist enemy. How much this disastrous change was due to causes beyond our control and how much it can be



charged to errors of individual Americans remains a mystery. In any case it occurred and those who happen to be in power must accept the blame for failure, just as they accept the credit for success.

3. The decision to leave Korea in June 1949 now appears as an error which undoubtedly played a big part in making an invasion of Korea seem to the aggressors to be a profitable venture. Had we kept the flag flying it is doubtful that the aggression would ever have taken place.

4. To these tragic miscalculations was added the tragic inadequacy of our reaction to the Korean War.

### III. AS REGARDS THE FUTURE

The hearings disclosed a vast area of agreement between General MacArthur and those in official positions, notably as regards the policy to be followed concerning the defense of America in Europe and generally throughout the world. Insofar as disagreements are concerned, the hearings raised the following prime controversial question: Should the United States bomb the bases used by the Chinese Communist armies in Manchuria?

This question is essentially a technical military one. The evidence shows, for example, that there have been days in the past when such a bombing would have been to the advantage of our troops, assuming always that the Soviets did not intervene. There were other days on which it would have been disadvantageous to our troops because they were concentrated in areas where the Chinese could have bombed them more easily than we could have hit the Chinese. The estimates that bombing the Chinese bases would give great immediate help to our troops and that the Communist air reaction against us either in South Korea or Japan would not be formidable are impressive. Of overriding importance was the testimony of General Vandenberg that our Air Force was not powerful enough to bomb the bases in Manchuria and at the same time carry out his mission of deterring the Soviet Union from direct aggression. Technical questions, which are frequently changing in accordance with a multiplicity of circumstances, are clearly questions which neither Congress nor the American public, with their lack of secret information and of background data of all sorts, can possibly decide.

The basic issue which this question raises hinges on one's estimate of Russian reactions—and General MacArthur was scrupulously careful to point out that he did not speak as an expert on matters outside of the far-eastern theater. Russian intentions are, of course, a matter involving knowledge of many subjects which are completely outside of the far-eastern theater, inasmuch as the place where decisions are made is in Moscow, which is in European Russia. Unfortunately the committee heard none of the accepted American authorities on the Soviet Union, although it did hear the department heads who presumably have access to the best opinions. These officials were unanimous in the view—which they did not, however, exhaustively document—that the bombing of Manchurian bases would probably provoke the Soviet Union and they frowned on any policy of "drop bombs and take a chance."

### IV. CONCLUSIONS

The fact that the bombing of Chinese bases is a technical question, should not blind us to the fact that the desire to end the war in Korea and thus keep faith with the troops is not a technical question at all. It is a long-range policy question and a moral question which is clearly within the power of Congress and of the American people to decide—which, indeed, they cannot avoid.

1. The evidence indicates unmistakably that we are not keeping faith with the sol-

diers in Korea insofar as making maximum use of the time which they are gaining for us is concerned. While they sacrifice their all over there we muddle along in an atmosphere of politics and business as usual over here.

2. The evidence shows that the Soviets are gaining on us in strategic aviation; are actually ahead of us in tactical aviation and in air defense; and that the current administration proposals will not give us this utterly vital superiority in air power. While the Army and Navy are equally vital, in the present state of the world, aviation is the point of the spear. We should use the precious time which the men in Korea are gaining for us to build this strength as rapidly as possible. But we are not doing so.

3. The evidence further indicates that the real enemy in Korea is not the Chinese Communists, but Soviet Russia. Soviet Russia could doubtless end the aggression in Korea immediately if it wanted to. General MacArthur's inference that the Korean War cannot be ended by military action in Korea alone seems eminently wise. There may be some dispute as to where any action which might be contemplated outside of Korea should be taken. But there can be no dispute that, if we were strong enough militarily, we could put the requisite diplomatic pressure on the Kremlin, that the war in Korea would end and that the further slaughter of our young men would stop. In these circumstances, our failure to build essential military strength as rapidly as possible is an unprecedented failure to support our own troops.

4. The evidence also shows that the effort to develop effective allies has not proceeded as rapidly or on as large a scale as should have been the case. Had we begun such an effort in 1945 by training selected young military leaders, there would at the time of the Korean outbreak have been effective and friendly military forces in many countries—notably in Korea and in China—where we have instead been required to use a disproportionate number of our own troops. In Europe, too, the development of military units of Volunteers for Freedom can mean legitimate saving of American manpower which singly cannot carry the load—on land, on sea, and in the air—which otherwise will be expected of it.

5. We should cease obliging the Soviet Union by splitting with our allies in one part of the world over what happens in the other. For the Soviets to succeed in using far-eastern questions as a device to break up the North Atlantic alliance would be the cheapest great victory in history and would brand our diplomacy as asinine before the world. The State Department, functioning effectively as a great persuader, should have been able to reconcile these problems so that we work together in the east and cooperate in the west in rapidly building an impressive military force. There is not only no conflict between these goals: success in one area makes for success in the other. These are not at all impossible goals for an American diplomacy which is functioning properly. By the same token, the application of firm diplomatic pressure, once we have rebuilt our military strength so that the Soviet Union will become a peaceful member of the family of nations is a task which an efficiently functioning State Department should be able to perform.

6. But we cannot expect foreign policy and diplomacy to be conducted dynamically and with real drive and enthusiasm so long as there is the present lack of public confidence in the State Department. A year ago, as a minority member of the Tydings committee of unhappy memory, I pointed out that it is absolutely vital that there be a new birth of public confidence in the State Department and outlined a series of steps to take which

would have made important progress toward that end. The need for a new birth of public confidence in the State Department is even more pressing today—and it is tragic that some of the most essential steps to create that confidence have not been taken.

### V. STRENGTH FOR PEACE

The application of pressure to the Kremlin need not bring war; the Kremlin makes war only on those who are weak or unready. The quickest way to prevent world war III from occurring is to end the so-called limited war which is now being fought. The longer it lasts, the greater the chance of its spreading.

The delay in getting this country on a sufficiently strong military footing so that it will have the unquestioned initiative over the Soviet Union and can thereby achieve the organization of a durable peace is one of the tragic mysteries of this era and one which runs counter to our tradition. When the aggression broke out in Korea in June 1950, I assumed that it would be the signal for a major effort to regain the initiative which we had thrown away in 1945 and 1946 and quickly put real pressure for peace on the Kremlin. Instead there came a series of unpleasant surprises indicating that this was not to be the policy. There was the failure immediately to change our military manpower legislation in the summer and autumn of 1950. There was the custom of several American representatives at the United Nations to eat with and have smiling handshaking pictures taken with the representatives of the Soviet Union—the nation, which as we all know, was responsible for the North Korean aggression and with whose representatives one can work without fraternizing. There is the "dog eat dog" and "every man for himself" attitude regarding control of inflation now prevalent in Washington.

All are indications of a belief that the "limited" war in Korea does not require us as citizens to do our full share. And month by month the cream of our young manhood—the recent West Point classes, the young leaders in our Army and Marine Reserve, the young men from every corner of America who serve in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines—swell the casualty list. These casualties are a tragedy for us. They are equally a tragedy for Europe since so many of these young men would have been the leaders in the Armed Forces now being created for North Atlantic defense.

This does not challenge the decision, which is undoubtedly wise, not to involve more forces in Korea than are already involved there. I have confidence in our military leaders. It does not deny that we have made some headway in building strength and that the words of official policy often express sound ideas. But it does challenge the failure to take all measures within our power—economic, military, and political—to end the war through application of pressure on the Kremlin, and to do so as rapidly as we can.

Failure to do all in our power to support our troops is a new development in America. It is a most unhappy one, full of baleful consequences for the future. It shocks our national sense of decency.

We should without delay build air superiority. We should pay what it costs in taxes, in inconveniences, and in sacrifice. In addition to building this weapon, we should also rehabilitate our State Department so that it can use this weapon as part of a dynamic foreign policy to put firm pressure for peace on the Kremlin to end the war in Korea and become a civilized member of the family of nations. We can then organize the peace which we should have organized in 1945 and 1946, those years when we threw away our Armed Forces and the power for peace which we had won at the cost of a million casualties.



CABLEGRAM SUBMITTED BY SENATOR LODGE IN CONNECTION WITH HIS REQUEST FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

JULY 25, 1951.

General de Lattre is arriving Paris shortly and later going to Washington on invitation Joint Chiefs. Realize how great burden is of your official duties and have hesitated to suggest another trip to Europe by you so soon after conclusion your previous one. However, do urge you give consideration to possibility coming here latter part August seeing de Lattre and if you think appropriate accompanying him on flight to United States; also, in view your previous close association French Army your visit here would present opportunity visit some French military installations which successive Ministers of Defense have repeatedly invited you to do.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in order that an explanation may be made—and it will be a very brief one—it must be understood that this item relates to the State Department proper, and has nothing to do with the controversy which arises with reference to the Voice of America.

The subcommittee commenced its hearings on this bill in February. We covered some 2,300 pages of hearings. We went into every item and every phase of the matter. Long before the House had passed the bill, we were working on it. The House did not pass the bill until the 27th of July. At that time we were about ready to mark up the bill.

Let me say to the Senate that a cut at this place in the bill will seriously cripple the effectiveness and the work of the State Department. I wish to present a few figures in that connection.

For this item the recommendation of the committee is \$74,487,777, which is \$2,912,203 below the budget estimate of \$77,400,000, \$1,012,233 below the House committee's figure, and it is \$1,487,777 over the appropriation provided by the House when action was taken on the floor. The recommendation is arrived at by applying a 10-percent cut on personnel to the domestic employees of the Department and the local personnel employed overseas by the Foreign Service. However, Americans in the Foreign Service would be exempted.

Mr. President, some things were said yesterday by the able Senator from Illinois regarding the cutting down of the Foreign Service. If the Foreign Service is cut down, the young people who have only recently entered the Foreign Service and who must eventually develop into representatives in the Foreign Service will be eliminated. That is where the cut will take place, because those of junior service naturally get the brunt of the cut; and thus the effectiveness of the State Department in years to come would be seriously hampered.

The committee, Mr. President, in reducing the request of the Department by \$2,913,223—which it did—has effected a 10 percent reduction in the personnel-service request for the Department staff

in this country, and a 10 percent reduction in the personnel-service request for the local employees in the foreign service. Further reduction to \$70,000,000 would require an additional reduction of 286 departmental employees, 273 Americans in Foreign Service, and 258 local employees, all of which would have a serious effect upon the overseas missions, as most of the activities carried on by the Department in Washington are in direct support of the diplomatic negotiations and other negotiations carried on by the overseas missions.

I would merely like to say that, while the committee worked diligently toward a reduction in this bill, we did not want actually to destroy or hamper the service to a point where the Department or any of its branches would be made utterly ineffective.

I appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I travel with him in his thought regarding reductions in order that the overhead costs of the Government may be decreased. It must come at some time, but we should not destroy a facility or agency of the Government which is altogether essential; and I say in all seriousness, after a long study of this subject, that the amendment of the able Senator from Illinois would in my judgment impair the effectiveness of the Department of State.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will yield time to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I dislike very much indeed to differ with the Senator from Illinois, for whom I have very genuine affection and high admiration. In this case, I feel compelled to do so. The Senator from Illinois has talked a great deal about the fountains in Trafalgar Square, about Yale, Harvard, and Princeton, about Groton School, and about St. Paul's School; but so far as I recollect he has not talked about the great increase in the responsibilities of the State Department which have developed since 1942. The Senator from Illinois has not specified to what divisions of the State Department or with respect to what functions the reduction in funds he proposes should be applied. With all due respect for the good faith of the Senator from Illinois, it seems to me that this is another instance of hit-or-miss so-called economy, of haphazard rule-of-thumb so-called economy. I do not believe that this great department of our Government, a department which deals with matters of the most vital importance, matters which affect the security and peace of our country, nay the security and peace of the whole world, should be handicapped by this disastrous procedure. It is a policy which I think would cripple the basic machinery of our foreign relations.

Mr. President, I wish to add but one more thought. I have had many dealings with the State Department, I know

many of the men in that Department. There may be men in that great Department of 20,000 employees who are ineffective or whose character and ability might be justly criticized; but there I am confident are few in number. Generally speaking, I believe that there is no harder-working, more conscientious group in all the Government service than the men and women who toil day and night in the State Department, here in Washington and in every other part of the world, wherever their far-flung duties may lie.

Mr. President, it is time that we should exercise restraint in the matter of haphazard criticism of the men who are serving their country both in responsible, and, in subordinate positions, not only in the State Department, but in all the departments of our Government. I tell you, Mr. President, that if we continue to attack the character, the patriotism, the ability, the good faith, and the industry of these men, and subject them to accusations or insinuations of treason, of disloyalty or immorality, or to baseless charges of laziness and inefficiency, the time will inevitably come when it will be impossible to recruit men of ability and of character to enter the Government service. They will refuse to give of themselves, to cut themselves off from their families and their friends and their businesses, in order to serve their country. I tell you, Mr. President, we must now give careful thought to the implications of what has been going on. I think the time has come to take heed, to give praise where praise is due, and not endlessly to blame, to cant, to charge, to criticize, and recriminate.

I very much hope that this amendment of my distinguished friend from Illinois, a haphazard, and hit-or-miss amendment, will be defeated, and that the committee amendment will be adopted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, so that it may be answered, if there be any answers, I wish to make the statement that as regards the number of personnel, in 1951 the personnel was actually 4,468. In 1952 the estimate is 4,715. The committee bill provides for 4,244. The bill is 471 under the estimate, that is, under the budget, and the committee bill is 224 under last year. I am referring to domestic personnel.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The figures which I gave were taken from the justification advanced by the State Department itself, on page 10.

Mr. McCARRAN. That includes the Voice of America.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The number in the Department of State itself, according to these figures, rose from 6,142 in 1942 to 13,773 in 1951. That also includes personnel overseas.

Mr. McCARRAN. It includes those in the Foreign Service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not care to prolong this discussion, but I do wish we could consider questions of the budget without either personal attacks or statements that attempts to



reduce the budget constitute personal attacks. I stated yesterday that I thought that in the past appointments in the Foreign Service had been drawn from a somewhat restricted section of American society, and we all know that to be the truth. The State Department has partially, but not wholly, moved away from that practice. I am not criticizing any member of the State Department; I merely state that there are too many of them.

It always happens that when one proposes to reduce the number of employees, some Member of the Senate rises and says I am attacking the character of the men in a given service. I am not attacking their character; I am saying that we should enable their character to improve and flourish by letting them work at some more useful occupation. There is nothing that destroys character more thoroughly than sitting around a desk, not doing very much, or talking with one's fellows. I want to get these young men into the bright sunlight of America, working with their hands, or in the Armed Forces, leading vigorous, virile lives. My purpose is to improve their character. I think this would be a great forward step.

Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this discussion. I do not even wish to ask for the yeas and nays, if that will take too much time, but when we come to vote I should like to have a division.

Mr. NEELY (and other Senators). Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.]

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I think I was on my feet when the Chair was about to announce the result of the vote on the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator was on his feet. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, 8-23-51-F.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. What is the parliamentary status now? Is the Senator from California offering an amendment to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the situation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Has the Chair announced the result of the vote on the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not on the committee amendment. The Senator from California was on his feet before the Chair announced the result.

The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "\$74,487,777" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$74,280,662: *Provided, That*

no part of this appropriation shall be available to pay the compensation of any person employed in the Division of Public Liaison or to pay any expenses incurred by such Division."

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, an error has been made in the indication of the line affected by the amendment. I should like to modify the amendment to make it read "line 6" rather than "line 4."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the modification will be made.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is one which I think will be easily understood by the Members of the Senate. It is an amendment which, so far as money is concerned, involves very little as compared with some of the amendments which have been offered to the appropriation bills.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the Senator now addressing himself to his amendment on page 4, line 4, to strike out certain amounts?

Mr. NIXON. Page 4, line 6, is the proper designation in the amendment.

Let me say at the outset of my remarks that my general attitude on appropriations for the State Department was fairly well indicated by the vote which immediately preceded the offering of this amendment.

As Members of the Senate are probably aware, I have voted consistently for economy motions during the consideration of appropriation bills up to this time, and it is my intention to vote as consistently in the future, I trust, for such economy moves.

However, I opposed the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, which would reduce, over all, the appropriations for the State Department because, in my opinion, after considering the report of the committee and after discussing the matter with members of the committee, I felt that the amount of money which the committee recommended for the State Department was as low as efficient operation would permit at this time.

I should like to say that I join with other Members of the Senate in commending the chairman and members of the committee for conducting such a thorough study of the appropriations requested by the State Department and the other departments covered by this bill.

Let me say also, prior to a discussion of this amendment, that it is my intention to support another amendment during the course of the debate this afternoon which would increase the appropriation for one of the functions of the State Department. I refer to the so-called Voice of America amendment, of which I am a cosponsor. I shall vote for that increase for reasons which I hope I shall have an opportunity to discuss later on when that amendment is presented for consideration.

Both of these amendments would affect propaganda functions of the State Department but there the similarity

ends. The Voice of America program has as its purpose the selling of American policy abroad. The purpose of the Division of Public Liaison which would be eliminated if my amendment should be adopted is to sell the State Department policy at home in the United States of America.

Let me say that in commenting upon the activities of this Division, I intend to cast no reflections whatever on any of the personnel who are employed by the Division. I do not know any of the employees of the Division. I have been informed that the Division is staffed with men of good character and real ability. I assume that is the case. My only question, so far as this Division is concerned, is as to its function.

In determining whether this Division should be continued—and it will be continued if we do not adopt this amendment—I think we should apply the test which should always be applied in the consideration of appropriations during periods of heavy spending for defense purposes.

Mr. President, I think we all recognize that some functions which are conducted by the Government are desirable, and that in ordinary times funds could well be appropriated by the Congress for such desirable purposes. There are other functions which are not only desirable, but which are necessary, necessary for the national defense during a period such as the one in which we find ourselves at the present time. I think that when we apply the test of desirability and necessity to the Division of Public Liaison of the State Department, we shall find that that Division does not meet the test.

Let us consider what the division does. I am not going to take too much time to describe its activities, but I think perhaps I can indicate the character of its activities by pointing out that one of its primary functions is to conduct seminars in the city of Washington for the purpose of indoctrinating representatives of various organizations who are brought here from all over the United States, on the current State Department policy.

Let me say that, so far as the State Department is concerned, that is perhaps a desirable function. So far as the administration is concerned, interested as it is in selling its line of policy, that is perhaps a desirable function. So far as the Nation is concerned, however, at a time when it is essential that we eliminate desirable functions which are not necessary, I submit that the functions of this division are not necessary.

I think one of the best proofs that its functions are not necessary is that this country got along without a Division of Public Liaison until 1944. I would suggest to the Members of the Senate that if we look at the record of the State Department in the field of foreign affairs since 1944 and compare it with the record of the State Department before 1944, most of us would conclude that the record before 1944 does not suffer by comparison with the record since that time.

I also think as we consider whether these functions are necessary, as dis-



tinguished from simply being desirable from the standpoint of the State Department or the administration, we should look a bit further at the type of activities which the Liaison Division conducts.

Let me read to the Members of the Senate the description of the activities of the Division of Public Liaison, and let the Members of the Senate themselves judge whether they are necessary as distinguished from being desirable. I am reading from the chart of organization of the State Department itself. It—

(a) Maintains relations with private groups and organizations and individuals interested in international affairs, \* \* \*

(b) Maintains relations with domestic information media, providing information concerning international affairs and assistance in the development of radio materials and programs, except for news items released to the press.

Let me make one point very clear, Mr. President. The amendment would have no effect whatever on the Press Section of the State Department. The amendment would have no effect upon the staffs of the various divisions heads and policy makers of the State Department. Those staffs can, of course, carry on with any domestic information program they desire.

Reading further we find:

(d) Provides information and advice to Department officers based upon contacts with private organizations, groups, and individuals interested in international affairs.

In other words, it is the purpose of this division to learn what the people of the country are thinking generally, so that the Department, I assume, may be better qualified to conduct a program of propaganda in favor of the line the Department may want to sell at the particular time.

Let me say again that I have no quarrel with the right of the Department to attempt vigorously to sell its program to the country. All I say is that the American people should not be called upon to foot the bill for doing the selling to the extent of \$207,000 a year. It may be said that is a small sum. But I say that the American people should not be taxed for the purpose of employing propaganda experts whose job it is to sell the people on a line which the administration of the State Department think they should be sold on.

Let us note another function of this division. It arranges public appearances and speaking engagements for Department officers. I think all Members of this body know that we arrange our speaking engagements and public appearances through our own offices. Certainly I do not think the American people should be called upon to dig into their pocketbooks and furnish the money so that employees of the State Department can go out and arrange speaking engagements for members of the Department who are interested in selling the particular line the Department wants to sell at the time.

I think, perhaps, I can give a good indication of the activities of this division by reading from a speech made by Secretary of State Acheson on November 15, 1950, at a conference on United States

foreign policy held here in Washington, D. C., and attended by representatives of service organizations, women's clubs, and other organizations of that type from throughout the United States. I read from one section of the Secretary's speech as follows:

During this past year there has been a great deal of criticism of the State Department, a great deal of thoroughly discreditable criticism because it hasn't had as its importance the objective of bringing out any fact but merely the destructive purpose of sowing the seeds of doubt.

Let me say that I respect the right of the Secretary of State to make that statement, to disagree with the critics of the State Department. But, by the same token, I say that the American taxpayers should not foot the bill for the purpose of organizing a meeting at which the Secretary of State can present only his side of the case, and I submit that at this conference those who honestly disagreed with the Secretary of State on the conclusion which he drew, did not have the opportunity to present their views. Only the views of the State Department and of the administration were presented.

Then I turn again to the same speech, to the conclusions of the Secretary of State as he addressed this group of civic leaders from throughout the United States:

While you are here go through our Department, talk to anyone that you would like to talk with. Go into any bureau, any office that you want and talk to any person that you see there. Have lunch with us. Discuss all sorts of matters with all of our officers and make up your own mind on what kind of a State Department this is. And if you think, as I think, that it is a good State Department, one of the best which this country has ever had in its long history, I hope you won't keep that information altogether to yourselves.

Again, I would have no respect for a Secretary of State unless he contended that his State Department was a good one, one of the best, as he says, in the history of the country. But, by the same token, I say that the American taxpayer should not pay the bill for the purpose of giving the Secretary of State a forum in which he can sell to the people his point of view on such a controversial issue. I say again that at this forum no opportunity was presented to those who might have disagreed honestly with the Secretary of State on his evaluation of the State Department, to present their views on that issue.

Mr. President, I think that this brief analysis of the functions of this division will give the Members of the Senate a fairly good idea as to why I have submitted the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Are there included radio speeches at local points to which State Department officials are sent?

Mr. NIXON. Yes. The Division distributes radio broadcasts, motion pictures, and educational packets to women's clubs, and similar organizations throughout the country.

Mr. LANGER. There is no time given to those who may be in opposition to the

views of the State Department, to present their views?

Mr. NIXON. So far as the description furnished by the State Department is concerned, this is solely a program sponsored and conducted by the State Department, for the purpose of selling the State Department's views to these organizations.

Mr. LANGER. It is purely propaganda?

Mr. NIXON. It is purely propaganda. Let me say I have a great respect for propaganda. I believe in propaganda. As I have indicated, I intend to support an increase in the appropriation for our propaganda overseas; but so far as propagandizing the American people in connection with controversial issues is concerned, such as the issue of foreign policy, I do not believe that the American people should have to pay for propagandizing themselves.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NIXON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Does the Senator feel that if an organization like the American Legion, for example, wishes to make certain factual inquiries as to what the policy of the State Department is in certain respects, the State Department should have no one there to give the information?

Mr. NIXON. The Senator from Michigan has mentioned the American Legion. I know that various organizations, such as the National Federation of Women's Republican Clubs, to mention a partisan organization, the National Civil Liberties Clearing House, the Textile Workers Union, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, have participated in round-table discussions which have been conducted. I certainly agree that any organization which wanted to learn how the State Department was operating and what its policies are should have an opportunity to do so; but I submit that it is not necessary to set up a division with a chief, various assistants to the chief and secretarial staffs, for the purpose of putting out unsolicited information to organizations all over the country.

Let me say further that I believe that there are plenty of people in the State Department, in the Secretary's Office, and in the offices of the various chiefs of divisions, who could furnish the information, and who will furnish it if this Division does not exist.

Mr. MOODY. Is it the point of the Senator from California that the people should be there, but that they should not be called a division?

Mr. NIXON. No. It is my position that it is not necessary to hire additional employees for the purpose of giving out information concerning the State Department's policy and for selling its program.

Let me point out to the Senator from Michigan—I am sure he must have heard me speak of it a moment ago—that this amendment does not affect the press section of the State Department. I assume that the press section could conduct some of the functions of this division. I believe that whatever necessary func-



tions need to be conducted to inform the people as to the operations of the State Department can be conducted by the thousands of employees of the State Department who will remain even if this division is eliminated.

Mr. MOODY. I am glad to hear the Senator from California agree that the people of the United States should have ready access to information on foreign policy, which is the purpose of this division. I assure the Senator from California that, as one who has had a little experience with the Press Section, the Press Section has plenty to do taking care of the press. For the Senator's information, I have before me an unsolicited letter which was written to Mr. Ben Crosby, of the Division of Public Liaison, the one we are discussing, by Mr. Martin Buckner, director of the national security commission of the American Legion. He says:

In the 6 months that have gone by since our January meeting I have heard nothing but favorable comment on the program you gave us in the State Department.

He ends a rather long letter by saying:

I hope it will be possible for you to remain through the convention as a consultant to all of our committees, because even after a formal presentation by your Department heads many of our committeemen look to you for personal contact and counsel.

If the Senator will further yield, I am sure that he is conscious of the fact that in many respects the American Legion has been critical of the foreign policy of the American Government. The junior Senator from Michigan happens to know that in a great many cases inquiries have been directed to the group in this particular office, under Mr. Crosby, calling upon them to explain, factually the position of the Government, which later has been commented upon favorably or unfavorably by the Legion.

The point is that there should be someone in the State Department to provide the facts as to the position of the Government to any Americans who may inquire. That does not mean to say that those who inquire about the position of the State Department must agree with it. However, I believe that any American citizen ought to have facilities to find out what the position of the Government is, and why. I think the junior Senator from California will agree with that statement. Perhaps he does when he says that the same information might be given out by someone else in the Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I happen to be familiar with the workings of this division. I cannot understand why it is desired to eliminate it, when its elimination would not save a cent. It is admitted that it would not save anything.

The statement is made that someone else could give out information to anyone who might request information from the

State Department. That is absolutely true. The elevator operator, the telephone girl, or anyone else who happened to be standing around could give out any kind of information. That is not what we want in a competently operated department.

I happen to know two men in this division. One of them is a Virginian and the other is a Kentuckian. I happen to know that one of them was a lieutenant colonel in the war. He was a soldier who fought all over Africa. There is no question of communism or anything like that involved in this issue. This division is an informational division. It is not a publicity department.

It is suggested that the Press Section could give out information when teachers want it, and could handle the requests by colleges for speakers. What is it proposed to do? Is it proposed to send a reporter to a university to make a speech on a technical subject in regard to our foreign policy, which is guiding and deciding the destiny of our country? The Senator from Michigan [Mr. Moody] knows and I know, because I have been a newspaperman all my life, just how a newspaperman might handle the situation unless assigned to such duties, if he were busy on something else. He might say "Let them find out the best way they can," unless he were writing something for publication or entrusted with responsibility in a field in which many journalists excel.

We must have someone who is competent in charge of this work. The amendment before us would not save a dime. It is proposed to abolish a division with two or three employees working in it, a division which prepares programs and furnishes information. It does not produce films for propaganda purposes, but for educational purposes only and it does check the films which are produced.

I think there is nothing in the world any more valuable than to have in our State Department someone who checks on the information which goes out, and the material which is furnished for speeches. I myself have used the service. If I were to go back now and try to trace where the foreign policy of the country started; if I were to try to figure out the various steps leading to the creation of the United Nations at San Francisco, the Dumbarton Oaks agreements, the Atlantic Pact, and various other things which relate to our foreign policy, I would have to have the help of someone who could write up the history for me.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. I think if the Senator had studied the hearings on the appropriation bill he would have found that the information which he has just indicated would not be obtained from the Division of Public Liaison. This amendment does not affect the Division of Historical Policy Research. It does not affect the Division of Publications, or the Division of Public Studies. This amendment affects only the Division of

Public Liaison, which has for its purpose, as I indicated a moment ago, the organization of meetings in Washington and the arrangement of speaking engagements outside Washington, for the purpose of disseminating information of this type.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I hesitate to yield further until I answer the observations of the Senator from California, because this is one of the most useful agencies we have. What is the use of having the other agencies if the information is not given out to the country for the purposes for which it is needed?

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield briefly for a question. The Senator had his time. I should like to explain this subject.

Mr. NIXON. The Senator noted that I yielded quite generously when I had the floor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator yielded to other Senators. I did not encroach upon the Senator's time.

Mr. NIXON. Of course, the Senator is aware of the relations between the House and Senate and the press. Each of us has a problem of disseminating information.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly. Would the Senator abolish liaison between them?

Mr. NIXON. Does the Senator from Kentucky contend that even though some persons disagree with the State Department's policies—and there are some who disagree—the public should appropriate \$200,000 a year to disseminate this kind of information?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I consider it would be a good idea in certain cases to do so, because I think if we could get some Senators who are opposing the policy to go before the country we would not have to make any speeches at all on the other side. Of course, I have the highest regard for the Senator from California.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. NIXON. The Senator will have noted that I am one who has supported much of the same policy.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish he would help to maintain this service, because I believe it to be very useful, helpful, and necessary. I like the Senator from California, and I appreciate his attitude. I know he has been helpful, but I wish he would not take a position in opposition to this service. I believe he has been misinformed.

Mr. NIXON. I believe the Senator from Kentucky has been misinformed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will not the Senator from California help us in this matter? Will he not withdraw his amendment and let this division stand, and decide the matter on broad general terms?



Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Is it not correct to say that this group—and I happen to know some of the gentlemen, and they are very high-class men—also answer a great many letters which are sent to them by Members of the Senate and the House, requesting information on various subjects? I am advised that in 1 year they handled more than 20,000 letters. Is it not correct to say that without such help Members of the House and Members of the Senate could not properly answer their mail?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is absolutely correct. I will say that I have requested some information of this group. I have been working with political propaganda all my life, and I have never seen a more unbiased and factual presentation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. They give both sides of the issue.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does not this group also answer about 15,000 letters which are addressed to the President by people who ask for information?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is absolutely correct. Furthermore, the Hoover Commission recommended the service as absolutely necessary.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; except that I believe the Senator from Tennessee would like to ask some more questions. I shall be glad to yield later.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to ask whether, in the light of the service they are rendering, they should not have more money, instead of less. Perhaps a Senator will offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We had an amendment prepared to increase the appropriation by excluding it from the proposed cut. I was utterly amazed, I will tell my good friend the Senator from California [Mr. Nixon], when I came to the floor of the Senate and found an amendment which would cut the appropriation.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOODY. Does the Senator from Kentucky feel that if a person or an organization writes to the State Department asking for factual information about our foreign policy such inquiries should be ignored?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not think such requests should be ignored. Neither do I believe that they ought to be answered by the elevator boy. I believe there ought to be competent employees for that purpose. I believe the Division ought to have a file case with information in it, and someone should be in the office who knows something about the subject.

Mr. MOODY. If such inquiries are to be answered, is it not necessary to have someone there to answer them?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is absolutely necessary; yes. They have very few peo-

ple there. Only two or three people have been employed for that purpose. Is it common sense to close up the division and get two or three other people who do not know anything about the subject?

Mr. MOODY. Can the Senator see any common sense at all in saying that it should not be called a division and that it should be wiped out, but that there should be people there to answer inquiries from the American public?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not say that I do not see any common sense in saying it, because I want my good friend from California [Mr. Nixon] to go along with us. I know he is interested in the subject. He and I served together in the House of Representatives. I know his fine ideas on this subject. I should like to have him come along and leave it the way it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the amendment offered to abolish the Division of Public Liaison is no doubt a commendable attempt on the part of its distinguished sponsor to cut down on "Government press agents." I am most certainly opposed to the type of Government information operation which is in effect an attempt to build up the authority of the agency involved by lobbying with the public and even with the Congress for increased appropriations and increased authority.

In the case of the State Department's Division of Public Liaison, however, this is most emphatically not the case. A vote to abolish the Division of Public Liaison is actually a vote to deprive the American public of an authentic Government source which exists to provide them with the factual information concerning foreign relations. The small staff of the Division of Public Liaison, 47 in number, puts out no press releases, ghost writes no speeches, does not engage in lobbying activities of any kind. I would like to tell you what this small staff does do.

It provides background information on foreign affairs to the great national private organizations of this country and assists these groups in arranging meetings and obtaining speakers who can provide information which the public needs and must have. It provides the same service and help to groups opposed to the administration as it does to those groups which favor it, on the sound premise, so well affirmed by Jefferson, that there can be no intelligent public action without an informed public opinion. Its services to these groups, whose membership numbers over 50,000,000, is at their request.

It provides speakers from the Department of State for groups, meetings, and organizations who request them and who wish to question the men who are concerned with making and carrying out the foreign policy of this country. It has no stable of speakers; it merely arranges for policy-making officials to an-

swer the questions of their countrymen. Last year the Division was able to arrange for more than 1,500 talks in response to more than 3,500 requests.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to complete my prepared remarks first.

The Division answers all the public inquiry mail addressed to the President and to the Secretary of State on questions of foreign policy. Last year it answered nearly 20,000 such letters, of which more than one-third were congressional referrals.

It provides on request background information, sets up appointments with policy officers, and assists in every way it can the great private organization periodicals whose readership numbers tens of millions.

It provides on request information and arranges State Department participation in the public service programs on the national radio and TV networks.

It maintains the State Department's mailing lists for official publications and services on request libraries, colleges, teachers, organizations, and members of the public who wish to receive these publications. I wish to emphasize that no name is added to those mailing lists except by written request.

The Division of Public Liaison has a small staff—under 50—operating on a small annual budget—\$260,000. It was established in 1944 with the advice and consent of Congress to provide a central point in the complex and overburdened Department of State to which members of the public could come with their requests for information on matters of the most vital concern to them as citizens. Every year since 1944 its budget, functions, and operations have been scrutinized carefully by the Congress, and incidentally by the Hoover Commission which praised its make-up and work, and never until now has the Congress considered abolishing the work of this Division which was established to fill a long-felt public need.

This Division was established to serve the people of the United States, not to proselytize them. If the Senate votes to abolish it and its work, then the Senate of the United States is voting to deprive American citizens and taxpayers of a vitally important information service which is unobtainable elsewhere. A vote to abolish this Division would be a vote to deprive Americans of information concerning our action in world affairs, to deprive them of their inalienable right to have access to vitally important information on a subject before exercising another of their inalienable rights, namely, to pass judgment upon this Government at a free ballot box.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the chairman of the subcommittee yield a few minutes to me?



Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I recall, I have only 5 minutes remaining. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; provided it does not turn out to be 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I think one of the vitally important things we must do, if we are to maintain our position of leadership in the free world, is to have an informed public opinion.

The little agency with which this amendment deals does more, I believe, to present to the American people the pros and cons of what we are trying to do in our foreign policy and in relation to our international obligations and responsibilities, than does any other department or agency of the Government.

I have been very much impressed by the groups which have been coming to Washington, including such groups as the Boys' Nation, the Girls' Nation, and the splendid groups under the auspices of the American Legion and other organizations. This group or agency in the State Department arranges to take them to meet persons in the State Department who can answer their questions.

I also understand that when groups have come to Washington from other nations, for the purpose of learning something about our foreign policy, representatives of this agency arrange meetings for them also.

So I think this agency is of vital importance. I would be willing to vote for a larger appropriation for this agency, rather than for a reduced appropriation for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENTON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself completely with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and those of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I congratulate them both for taking the lead on this most important and vital subject.

I was responsible for this area of the State Department during my years as Assistant Secretary of State. I remind the Senate that over a long period of decades the State Department was charged with being secretive, with being overly cautious in the classification of its material, and with not only holding the cards too close to its chest, but actually with putting the deck of cards in its pocket.

This Division within the Department is the beginning of the answer to the charges of that kind. It is the beginning of the opening-up of our foreign

policy so that the American people can understand it. It is not only vital that this work be continued, but it should be expanded. The leadership is good. Mr. Francis Russell, of Boston, Chief of the Division, is known and admired from coast to coast. Hundreds of our great private organizations have established relationships with the State Department for the first time, due to his efforts and leadership.

The truth is that we in the Senate should now be debating the doubling of this appropriation, instead of the elimination of it.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding 1 minute to me.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this provision in general nature was recommended by the Hoover Commission. This agency has a place in the State Department.

I wish to say, in response to the statement of the Senator from Connecticut regarding increasing the amount of this appropriation, that I would not be in favor of doing that at all. I understand that a supplemental request may come to us later; and I wish to say now that, so far as I individually am concerned, I shall be opposed to it. I think the Department now is sufficiently staffed, and I believe it will be all right for the Department to go on as it is.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from California to the committee amendment will be rejected, although I wish to say that I have great respect and admiration for the junior Senator from California. However, I cannot go along with him as regards his amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] to the committee amendment on page 4, in line 6.

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr.

BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of a death in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

Also, on this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 45, as follows:

#### YEAS—28

|               |              |              |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Bricker       | Ferguson     | Mundt        |
| Butler, Md.   | Frear        | Nixon        |
| Butler, Nebr. | Hickenlooper | Schoeppel    |
| Byrd          | Kem          | Smith, N. C. |
| Carlson       | Knowland     | Watkins      |
| Case          | Langer       | Welker       |
| Cordon        | Malone       | Wherry       |
| Dirksen       | Martin       | Williams     |
| Dworshak      | McClellan    |              |
| Eaton         | Millikin     |              |

#### NAYS—45

|           |             |                |
|-----------|-------------|----------------|
| Aiken     | George      | Holland        |
| Benton    | Gillette    | Hunt           |
| Clements  | Green       | Ives           |
| Connally  | Hayden      | Johnson, Colo. |
| Douglas   | Hendrickson | Johnson, Tex.  |
| Duff      | Hennings    | Kefauver       |
| Ellender  | Hill        | Kerr           |
| Fulbright | Hoey        | Kilgore        |



Lehman  
Lodge  
Magnuson  
McCarran  
McFarland  
McKellar  
McMahon

Moody  
Morse  
Murray  
Pastore  
Robertson  
Russell  
Saltonstall

Smathers  
Sutton, Maine  
Sparkman  
Stennis  
Thye  
Underwood  
Young

## NOT VOTING—23

Anderson  
Bennett  
Brewster  
Bridges  
Cain  
Capehart  
Chavez  
Eastland

Flanders  
Humphrey  
Jenner  
Johnston, S. C.  
Long  
Maybank  
McCarthy  
Monroney

Neely  
O'Connor  
O'Mahoney  
Smith, N. J.  
Taft  
Tobey  
Wiley

So Mr. Nixon's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Byrd-Ferguson amendment was adopted yesterday, to enable me to insert a brief amendment. The purpose of the amendment, which would not appropriate additional money, would be to exempt from the 25 percent blanket staff reductions the liaison design of the State Department, which we have just been discussing. The function of this division is to provide information on a factual basis to citizens and organizations seeking to learn about and appraise our foreign policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, may we have the request stated? It was absolutely impossible, because of a lack of order in the Senate, to hear the request.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee has informed me that he will bring this matter up, out of order, at a later time.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may we have order? It is impossible to hear a word that is being said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan requests reconsideration of an amendment which was adopted yesterday. At a later time I should like to make a study of the matter which he proposes to insert. During the course of further consideration of the pending bill I shall confer with the Senator from Michigan in regard to taking up the matter which is the subject of his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MOODY. That is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois now has an amendment which comes up next in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Which amendment is the Senator about to call up?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Illinois will call up whatever amendment he desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment, which was passed over,

on page 4, line 8, which is next in order. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, in line 8, after the word "than", it is proposed to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$7,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Acquisition of Buildings Abroad," on page 5, line 5, after the word "Act," to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$7,000,000," and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert "of which not to exceed \$94,500 shall be available for personal services, and."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 8-22-51-D and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a proposal to reduce by \$2,000,000 the amount to be spent by the Government for the acquisition and construction of office buildings and residences for our diplomatic service abroad. There was a time when our diplomatic representatives abroad were very badly housed. I think that time has largely disappeared.

In the justification which the Department of State advanced in support of its request we find that in the past 5 years there has been expended for office quarters and residence quarters abroad a total of \$106,000,000. Then there is a further program embracing approximately \$86,000,000 which they wish to have carried out, making a total expenditure of \$192,000,000.

If we go over the items on page 19 of the slip sheets for the \$9,000,000 originally requested we find a very large number of residence at a unit cost which never falls below \$20,000, commonly \$25,000 per residence. In some cases the unit cost rises as high as \$50,000 per residence. We also find a provision for the construction of a large number of office buildings. I am in no sense a defeatist about the state of the world, but I do not think it would be a very good plan to increase our capital investments abroad in the form of large amounts in buildings at this time.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the Senator aware that in the construction of these office buildings certain exchange funds which otherwise might not be available will be used? In other words, the State Department receives an appropriation which is immediately turned back into the Treasury for foreign funds for surplus property, or ECA funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true, but I think the money could be better spent on the information and education service or in raw materials than in building elaborate palaces for our foreign diplomatic

representatives to live in or in which to conduct business. It is true that 40 years ago we did not have proper embassies in the major capitals of Europe, but we now have palaces in the major capitals of Europe. The diplomatic staff is now well housed. We have made in the past 5 years a capital investment of \$106,000,000.

I am not proposing that we stop the entire construction of properties or that we acquire no new properties. I am providing for \$5,000,000 of appropriations. I am merely saying that here is a chance to use the knife to reduce expenditures somewhat.

Mr. KILGORE. It is my hope that we can do what the Senator suggests. However, by buying buildings, using funds not otherwise available, we shall be saving money in futuro, as it were, against money we might not have to use in futuro. I agree with the Senator that we are paying absolutely fantastic amounts for rentals abroad. It is my hope that we can have buildings in those countries which will remain friendly to us in the future. I am wondering if the Senator from Illinois realizes what I have suggested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I do.

In Greece, where we already have \$1,700,000 worth of buildings, there is a proposal for another \$400,000 building.

In the Netherlands, where we have \$1,250,000 worth of buildings, there is a proposal for the expenditure of another three-quarters of a million dollars.

In Germany there is a proposal to build a \$50,000 house for the consul general at Frankfurt, a \$50,000 house at Bremen, and one in Stuttgart; a \$100,000 building on the Gold Coast; in Nicaragua there are to be four \$25,000 houses, plus \$150,000 worth of staff housing. In the Philippines there is to be a consular building costing \$60,000, and there is a whole series of projects which I think we could, with profit, curtail. I am not asking that they be eliminated; I am merely asking that we trim sail.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am in sympathy with what the Senator from Illinois is trying to do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amount of sympathy which I receive on these amendments is overpowering, until the vote comes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am going to vote with the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I happened to be in Tokyo in recent weeks. There officials are going "hog-wild" in trying to buy new buildings. They want to buy the best places in town, regardless of the cost. I see in the list 20 new buildings in Japan.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are 10 at an average of \$36,000 apiece. I think that when the members of the Diplomatic Service draw up their budget a line from the old popular ballad comes into their minds—"I dreamt that I dwelt in marble halls." They want marble halls in which to dwell.



Mr. MAGNUSON. I personally know about a residence in Nicaragua which is just a shack. We should have a good place there. But I think they have gone "hog-wild" in Tokyo.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There would still be \$5,000,000 left for this purpose if my amendment were agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The reason why I am going to support the Senator's amendment is that it seems to me the State Department should take a look at the different places and spend the money much more judiciously than they have apparently been spending it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. When he rose I thought he was going to fight my proposal but now I find him an ally.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. My thought was similar to that of the Senator from Washington. I question whether we should appropriate \$5,000,000 this year and let them do as they please with it, or whether it would be better to draw an amendment which would place certain limitations in certain areas. I am wondering if the Senator from Illinois has such an amendment in mind, because I should like to support it. I should also like to see the counterpart fund of the ECA used in the purchase of buildings abroad to save rentals on consulates and other buildings. I do not believe in wasting the money on extravagant buildings. I wish we might particularize, because I well remember that in Rome the State Department bought a full city block, and after it was purchased it was discovered that it was a public park, and they could not remove a single tree to erect a building. The trees grew so thickly that they could not put a building between them. So the block was still vacant in 1946.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know who is the best salesman. I think the crowd in Tokyo have been doing probably a better selling job, because even before Japan becomes technically a country again they have been going around picking up properties. They do not want anything modest or average; they want to find the best and most palatial houses they can find in Tokyo.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad the Senator from Washington has corroborated some of the statements I have made, namely, that the members of the State Department are recruited from a group which tends to love high living.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator from Illinois have any information as to the relative cost of renting the buildings in which embassies are now housed, and of acquiring such buildings?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Department claims that from 1947 through 1952 they have saved approximately \$2,000,000 through the cancellation of leases.

Mr. CASE. What was the amount?

Mr. DOUGLAS. \$2,000,000 was saved from 1947 to 1952 because of the cancellation of leases. I do not know how much that amounts to on an annual basis. But in order to save that \$2,000,000, the Government spent \$106,000,000. So I would think that what we have done has been to house our representatives on a very elaborate scale.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Is it not true, however, that this is merely a bookkeeping transaction, a paper transfer of money in the Treasury and charging it to the appropriation for the State Department, and using it to purchase from the Treasury foreign currencies already owned by the United States and then using those foreign currencies for the purpose of acquiring buildings?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will say that simply because we have credit with foreign countries does not mean that we have to use it for acquiring elaborate buildings. My point is that we have drifted very far away from the original democratic simplicity of this country, of simple buildings and simple living. We are going in for elaborate buildings, tremendous offices, tremendous equipment, costly furnishings, all at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States. We are moving out of what we might call a republican period with a small "r", into an imperial period. I think we should cut down on this scale of expenditures. It is bad for our foreign relations to have our Foreign Service officers working and living in splendor while the people of the countries involved live in squalor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the able Senator from Illinois will not prevail. The Bureau of the Budget fixed the amount at \$9,000,000. The House reduced the amount to \$8,000,000. The subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations reduced it to \$7,000,000.

I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that 4 years ago, when this item first appeared, the chairman of the subcommittee felt the same way as has been expressed today by the Senator from Illinois. After making a study of the subject I came to the conclusion that what is provided is about as good use as we could possibly make of foreign credits. I have grave doubt that we will ever get very much out of them unless we get something tangible now, while we have them. The acquisition of valuable property in various places through the world seems to me to be a good way to transfer something that is dubious as to value into something that is actually of value. For that reason I have supported a limited program up to this time. I think this is a very limited program now. I hope the item may not be reduced.

The Senator from Illinois has already referred to the fact that the program does reduce rentals. It reduces rentals we have to pay for buildings and property which the Government of the United States occupies abroad.

As regards the complaint that we are purchasing palatial places, I wish to say that is not universally true. It is true

that some of the buildings we have acquired have been, in times past, called palaces. But at the present time they are anything but that. The buildings are, however, valuable property, well located in the centers where they are, and it is worth while for the Government of the United States to own them.

I do not think the Senator from Illinois meant to use the expression he last used, that the people of this country are living in hovels.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; the people of the other countries.

Mr. McCARRAN. I stand corrected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. The people in the other countries.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry. I understood it the other way. I think the buildings our foreign representatives occupy should be in keeping with the dignity of this Nation, and especially do I think so when, as a matter of fact, we are not using American dollars for the acquisition of the property. We are using only credits we have for surplus property of which we disposed after the Second World War. We have those credits. Whether they will always continue to be credits or whether they will be worth while is something of which I have grave doubt. I should like to see them turned into real estate, into something tangible, something worth while, so long as the purchase price does not come out of the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask the Senator if it is not true that a country is judged partly by the type of embassies it has?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is true. We are judged abroad by the manner in which our foreign representatives live. There is no question about that. But, aside from that, it is important to consider the stability and the location of the property at this time, particularly when the property can be acquired for less than it could be acquired if the economy of a particular country was at a higher level.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota. How much time does the Senator care to have?

Mr. CASE. Two minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am inclined to think that this can be one of those cases where the appearance might be that of economy, but the result something else. If it is true that as the result of the operations of this program the United States has saved \$2,000,000 in lease funds between 1947 and 1951—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. CASE. I yield. If the Senator can correct me on that figure, I shall be glad to have him do so.



Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to give the Senator the figures, and I ask him to yield to me in my own time.

Mr. CASE. Very well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Government saved \$2,000,000. In order to save that \$2,000,000, the Government spent \$106,000,000. In other words, it saved less than 2 percent on its investment.

Mr. CASE. Did the Government spend that much in cash, or did it use foreign currency credits which it had gotten in lend-lease settlements, or in counterpart funds under ECA? The junior Senator from South Dakota is no particular apologist or defender of the State Department's activities. The Senator from South Dakota has in many instances been critical of them. But the Senator from South Dakota did insist, when we put up the first money for ECA, that we should ask the countries involved to set aside 5 percent of the local currency counterpart funds for the exclusive use of the United States in meeting our expenses in the various countries, and for buying strategic minerals or materials. We have acquired something like \$165,000,000 worth of strategic materials or minerals out of the counterpart funds, and apparently we have acquired \$106,000,000 worth of property for our embassies in these foreign countries, if the figures presented by the Senator from Illinois relate to that, as I understand they do.

Mr. President, is it better to keep \$2,000,000 of foreign currencies on ice in the Treasury or to use them to acquire physical assets in the form of embassy buildings, which we can use, and which we need, and which will save our paying out so much rent? That seems to me to be the question involved here. It is not a question of spending dollars; that part is only a paper transaction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired. Does the Senator from Nevada desire to yield further time?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not know of any other Senator who wishes to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 5, line 5.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, before the yeas and nays are ordered, if I may I should like to comment very briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under the control of the Senator from Nevada. Does he yield time to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I think it is highly desirable that the United States own its embassy properties wherever possible, because then we know the structure of the buildings, we know all the wiring, and we know all the interior decorations of the buildings. It is much easier in this way for the United States to guard itself against subversive elements and those who might want to wire our buildings in order to listen to every word spoken throughout the embassy

quarters. For that reason I think it is highly desirable that wherever possible the United States own its own embassy properties in foreign countries. Consequently, I find it necessary to vote against this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 5, line 5. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 36, nays 36, as follows:

#### YEAS—36

|             |         |          |
|-------------|---------|----------|
| Aiken       | Carlson | Dworshak |
| Bricker     | Dirksen | Ferguson |
| Butler, Md. | Douglas | Frear    |
| Byrd        | Duff    | Gillette |

Hendrickson  
Hennings  
Hickenlooper  
Hoey  
Hunt  
Ives  
Kem  
Knowland

Lehman  
Long  
Magnuson  
Malone  
Millikin  
Moody  
Pastore  
Saltonstall

Schoeppel  
Smathers  
Smith, Maine  
Smith, N. C.  
Watkins  
Welker  
Wherry  
Williams

#### NAYS—36

Benton  
Case  
Clements  
Cordon  
Eaton  
Fulbright  
George  
Green  
Hayden  
Hill  
Holland  
Humphrey

Johnson, Colo.  
Johnson, Tex.  
Kefauver  
Kerr  
Kilgore  
Langer  
Lodge  
McCarran  
McClellan  
McFarland  
McKellar  
McMahon

Morse  
Mundt  
Murray  
Neely  
Nixon  
Robertson  
Russell  
Sparkman  
Stennis  
Thye  
Wiley  
Young

#### NOT VOTING—24

Anderson  
Bennett  
Brewster  
Bridges  
Butler, Nebr.  
Cain  
Capehart  
Chavez

Connally  
Eastland  
Ellender  
Flanders  
Jenner  
Johnston, S. C.  
Martin  
Maybank

McCarthy  
Monroney  
O'Connor  
O'Mahoney  
Smith, N. J.  
Taft  
Tobey  
Underwood

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 36, the nays 36—a tie; so the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the amendment of the committee is rejected.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Reflecting on the yea-and-nay vote just taken, I should like to say to the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that I have heard it said, "You might just as well kill a man as scare him to death."

Mr. DOUGLAS. And I have heard it said, "You cannot win."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 15, line 22, after the word "organizations", to strike out "\$85,000,000" and insert "\$63,000,000, of which not to exceed \$25,830,000 shall be available for personal services."

Mr. McCARRAN. This is the so-called Voice of America amendment. I am not speaking on it at this time. Perhaps some Senators wish to discuss it.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to strike out "\$63,000,000, of which not to exceed \$25,830,000 shall be available for personal services" and insert in lieu thereof "\$115,000,000."

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I shall address myself to the committee amendment which proposes to cut from \$85,000,000 to \$63,000,000 the appropriation provided by the House destined for the Voice of America and kindred activities. The \$85,000,000 allocated by the House is itself by no means sufficient in this critical area. The \$115,000,000 originally recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is by no means sufficient.



Based on my long experience in this field, I hope to be able to point out to the Senate today why it is folly to hamstring this important and potentially powerful program by a further cut of \$22,000,000 over and above the \$30,000,000 reduction previously made by the House. Although I believe the State Department has consistently had its sights too low in this field, and that its original request was inadequate to the challenge and the opportunity, the amendment I am offering calls only for restoration at this time of the figure proposed by the President and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, 6 years ago this month, the fighting and killing in World War II came to a stop. It was a grave time, a serious time; but, today, many of us look back on it with nostalgia. We thought—honestly thought—that the world might have seen its last big war. There were problems—terrifying problems—but many felt, with God's help, we could handle them. Under the United Nations we set about to find a way.

Many of us were gravely disturbed about the Soviet Union but we were not without hope that conflict would be avoided. During the war the U. S. S. R. had been our ally. She had been a brave ally. Her soldiers had fought courageously. She had lived up to her promise to launch a major attack on the eastern front coincident with the Normandy landings. Her people had stood up under hardships too terrible to try to put into words. Most Americans were willing—even glad—to accept the Russians as partners in the new great enterprise before us all—the building of a peaceful, prosperous world community based on confidence and fellowship. Most Americans hoped that the rulers of the Russian people would cooperate in this great enterprise.

We were soon undeceived.

Today the rulers of the Soviet Union have left no doubt in any man's mind that they do not want a world based on mutual confidence.

Yes; our theory is that a great Air Force, Army, and Navy will keep the Russians from attacking. But we have two other weapons in our own war for peace. That is a paradoxical phrase, but that is the point we have reached. We are waging peace. The two other weapons are foreign economic aid, which we are to debate next week, and our campaign of truth, the fate of which we are now deciding.

They do not yet dare attack the United States by force of arms, and we continue to hope that our growing military strength is such that they will not risk an armed attack. They do not want to participate in building cooperation between nations. They do not want friends whom they treat as equals. They want only to rule, and to control. And they want their control to be worldwide. The price they are prepared to pay, the risks they are prepared to run, in their efforts to acquire control, we do not yet know. The Russian leaders launched their aggressive campaign almost before the smoke of World War II had subsided. Psychologically, this ap-

peared to be the right moment for them. A war-shattered world was busy binding up its wounds. Millions of men and women the world over were dissatisfied with the prewar order, the order which had brought destruction and chaos. They wanted something new—something that offered them the promise of relief from age-old miseries. They wanted a faith in which to believe—and for which to work.

Seizing upon this unrest, the men of the Kremlin thrust forward. Wherever their armies had moved they remained. The armies were followed by political organizers who undertook to set up police states subservient to the Kremlin. Elsewhere, where they had no armies, they threatened, they promised, they connived.

Country after country fell before this combination of force, the threat of force, of propaganda, and subversion. The tens of millions of people behind the iron curtain became slaves to a tyranny as ruthless, cunning, and complete as any in history.

Today, Mr. President, the men in the Kremlin control the lives of some 800,000,000 people. Their rule stretches over roughly two-thirds of the earth's surface. The resources and manpower of this vast area are weapons in their hands.

Mr. President, the men in the Kremlin know that as long as hope endures no dictatorship is safe. They know that today the hope of freemen everywhere—the hope that flickers still in the hearts of their own enslaved millions—lies in the United States.

I do not say this boastfully. I say it in all humility. We of the United States have been fortunate. We were spared the physical destruction of both World War I and World War II. We were spared, too, the spiritual disintegration that almost inevitably follows in the wake of such destruction. We have enjoyed vast natural resources. Our great free internal market has spurred competition and fostered the creative skill of our people. Due also to the wisdom of our antitrust laws, we have developed an industrial potential undreamed of even a few decades ago.

The men in the Kremlin have learned the lesson that World War I had failed to teach Hitler. They know that as long as the United States remains free and strong their dream of world domination is idle.

They do not yet dare attack the United States by force of arms. We continue to hope that our growing military strength is such that they will never risk an armed attack. Their methods in the future will probably continue to be more subtle. They have, however, mastered the psychological weapons. The full strength and vigor of their campaign is little understood in the United States. It is to this point that I shall wholly address myself today, and upon it I shall base the case that the \$115,000,000 request of the President and the Bureau of the Budget be granted.

Hitler declared that big lies told often enough, told loudly enough, ceased to be lies in the ears of the listeners. Moscow adopted the Hitler technique.

It is estimated that the U. S. S. R. today is spending something between one and two billion dollars a year in its campaign of vilification against the United States.

This campaign is directed, first, to the Soviet peoples and the peoples of the satellite nations. Day and night the press, radio, theaters, schools, and other channels of propaganda in these lands repeat the accusations and vilifications. They tell the people that the United States wants war, that ours is a land of unbelievable misery for the great majority of its people, that we are the 1951 equivalent of Nazi Germany.

Not long ago Mr. John McCloy, the High Commissioner in Germany, estimated for me that the Russian propaganda expenditures against Germany alone approximate half a billion dollars a year.

Mr. President, listen to some typical statements made by Radio Moscow:

Death caused by undernourishment annually takes away the lives of thousands of Americans.

In lands where hunger is the common lot of man this is a believable statement. Millions under Soviet domination today know hunger. Millions elsewhere know hunger. They have seen their kinsmen, friends, dead of starvation. This is talking a language they can understand.

Here we have a favorite theme of Radio Moscow:

Lynching or electrocuting innocent people is a regular occurrence in democratic America.

Mr. President, here again the men of Moscow are talking a language their people can understand. Terror is as much a part of the daily fare of these people as hunger. Why should they not believe that the rare incidences of terror in other lands—thank God, rare indeed in the United States—are almost daily occurrences?

Let me go on:

Mothers sell their babies on the black market in the United States.

A black market is something the Russians understand. A country where babies are at a premium, where childless families will go to any length to fill the vacant places in their hearts, is hard for them to understand. Just what is meant by a "black market" in babies is outside their comprehension, but Radio Moscow uses this charge with great effect.

Here is another favorite theme:

The prisons of the United States are places of forced labor in which thousands annually perish. The American States ruthlessly exploit prison labor, seeing in it a source of large income.

Well, prison labor, slave labor—these are well understood in lands where thousands disappear overnight; where Siberia has been traditionally a word of terror over the centuries. It is estimated that some 15,000,000 political prisoners are now laboring in Russian prison camps. Why should they not believe that such, too, is the custom in the United States?

These are sample themes upon which Moscow harps continually in its campaign of hate against the United States. These are themes repeated throughout



the world—in the Communist press, over the radio, in speeches, wherever the written or spoken word penetrates.

Mr. President, I am afraid that many of us are still not fully awake to what is happening. I have heard men on this floor talk as though this campaign were of no particular interest to us. The suggestion further to cut the appropriation of funds to combat this campaign seems to imply that it can be laughed off or ignored.

I know something about our own early efforts to combat the Russian propaganda with a campaign of truth. As Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs in 1945, 1946, and 1947, I was given the job of telling the so-called American story. The Presidential directive under which I operated was simply to present a full and fair picture of American life and of the aims and policies of the United States Government.

Our original approach to this new and strange, to us, area in the field of foreign policy was a simple one.

"Look," we said to ourselves, "we can just tell the truth; we shall hold up a mirror to ourselves. We haven't anything to conceal. We haven't anything too difficult to sell—just friendship and understanding." We saw the job in these direct and explicit terms.

Because there were those in Congress who questioned the legality of this operation I developed recommendations for Congress which, under the leadership of Senators SMITH and MUNDT, were enacted into law. In 1948 Congress passed the Information and Educational Exchange Act setting up the State Department's Office of International Information, its Office of Educational Exchange, and the United States Information Service abroad.

The low point in our postwar activity was 1948. The appropriation for fiscal 1948 for these operations provided little more than a token budget. It totaled if I remember correctly, something like \$21,000,000. This was, of course, a mere drop in the bucket compared to the sums being spent by Moscow. Later, in 1950, the appropriation was raised to \$34,000,000 and after Korea to close to \$100,000,000. Again, relatively small sums. We were still thinking primarily in terms of telling the American story and hoping the audience would fill in the gaps and find its own answer to the Russian propaganda.

It became increasingly obvious to me in 1945, 1946, and 1947, while I served as Assistant Secretary of State responsible for this program, that our approach was inadequate. Events broadened and intensified the task which had to be undertaken. The charge of Communist propaganda could not be met by so simple an approach and so limited a program. Something more had to be done than merely telling our story to anyone who would go out of his way to listen.

In reply, our problem in the field of information and propaganda has become more—a great deal more—than just correcting Communist lies. If we are to win this battle for men's minds we must offer to the peoples of the world, in their

own terms, the great and vital hope that is inherent in the democratic ideal.

This is something more, Mr. President, than merely explaining our foreign policy. People all over the world want to know what we are doing and what we are planning to do in the future. It is something more than merely describing our universities, our cities, our unions, our music, and so forth. We need to tell the world in print, by radio, in movies, by exchange of persons, what they eagerly want to know about our production, our agricultural methods, our health and sanitation programs, and other down-to-earth problems. They want to know how we have tackled these problems. What progress we have made in solving them. What we are planning to do in the future. They want to know these things, however, not only in our terms, but in their terms. How can they, in cooperation with us and other free nations, achieve their own legitimate aspirations? Can they indeed do this better under the banner of freedom than enrolled in the Communist legions?

We must, above all, inspire the peoples of the world with the will to work and fight for a world in which we all can believe—the world of peace and increasing prosperity to which all men will give their faith and allegiance. We must, in short, sell them on their own future in terms of freedom, justice, and dignity for the individual.

This goal on our part can be a matter of life and death to the American people. If war comes the question of which countries will ally themselves with us may depend on how we operate in the area we are discussing now and during the next year, not at some unforeseeable date.

A year ago last March, in the Eighty-first Congress, I submitted, on behalf of myself and 12 other Members of the Senate, a resolution calling for what I termed a "Marshall plan of ideas." Some of the most distinguished men in the country including General Eisenhower, General Marshall, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, Mr. Bernard Baruch, Secretary Acheson, Ambassador John Foster Dulles, and Gen. David Sarnoff, appeared to testify strongly and specifically in support of the basic idea incorporated in this resolution.

During the past year many Members of Congress have recognized the growing importance of such a program. One is the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART] in his address on the floor of the Senate January 2 of this year. Books have been published on this problem, one of the most interesting—and I strongly recommend it to your reading—being War and the Minds of Men by Prof. Frederick Dunn, of Yale. Another is Wallace Carroll's great book, which I wish might be made compulsory reading for every Army and Navy officer, called Persuade or Perish. Many magazine articles have appeared dealing with the same subject.

This year the President asked \$115,000,000 for this area of operations in the field of foreign policy. In terms of other—let me repeat "other"—weapons in the struggle today that is probably

less than the price of one atomic bomb.

In terms of World War II this \$115,000,000 is the price of 20 minutes of actual warfare.

I remember hearing of one artillery barrage lasting just 4 minutes that cost something like \$67,000.

That request was whittled to \$85,000,000 on the other side of the Capitol. As it has now come to us from the Senate Appropriations Committee it is \$63,000,000.

Was it the opinion of the members of that committee that the United States could not afford this \$115,000,000? Over on the House side during the hearings one of our distinguished colleagues said just that. "This program is too ambitious," he declared.

Mr. President, we do not have, of course, exact figures on what the Russians are spending on their anti-American campaign. We can only judge the probable cost from what we can see and hear they are doing. I have used the figures "between one and two billion." It might well be more. As I said, High Commissioner McCloy estimated for me that one-half billion dollars is being spent for Russian propaganda in Germany alone.

I wish to compare the sum we are discussing, as agreed to by the House—\$30,000,000 under the request of the administration—as compared to some of the things the Russians are doing in the propaganda field.

Let us consider for a moment the Russian "jamming" of our broadcasts. I have received many questions as to whether the people in Russia actually hear our broadcasts. To keep their people from listening to the Voice of America, the Soviet propaganda bureau has set up approximately 1,200 "jamming" stations. The operation of each of these stations requires from 10 to 12 persons. This means that Russia has put to work from 12,000 to 15,000 persons solely to keep our Voice of America broadcasts from being heard in Russia.

The cost of merely operating these "jamming" stations could well be not too far from the figure of \$115,000,000 which my amendment proposes be allowed for this program.

The Soviet rulers take many other steps to prevent their people and the people of the satellites from listening to the Voice of America. In Russia and practically all the Russian-dominated areas radios must be registered. Prospective buyers of radio sets must pay a subscription fee. In some places they must sign a declaration that they will not listen, or permit anyone else to listen, to foreign broadcasts. In addition to this declaration, a further statement is required to the effect that they will not repeat anything they should just happen to hear.

It must cost plenty to police the radio owners. We can chalk that up also as expenditures in the Soviet propaganda war.

Foreign broadcasting by the Soviets increased during 1946-50 to almost double the previous number of hours. By 1950 these broadcasts, including those of the satellites and China, were more



than the combined broadcasts of the United Kingdom and the United States. The chief criteria in allocation of time seems to be, first, the nearness of the area to the U. S. S. R.; second, its strategic importance to Soviet foreign policy; and third, the capability of reaching the area by other means. The size of the potential audience and the number of receiving sets in the area seem to be less important factors. The cost?—well, the Communists are not thinking in terms of how much they can afford. They do the broadcasting and propaganda first, as they always have; then build the tanks and submarines with what they have left. This approach is the opposite of ours. Mistakenly putting our faith in force, and in our economic policies, we neglect the minds of men.

The Russians cultivate the minds of the masses, not because they respect them, but indeed because they hold them in contempt. Let us here in the United States not make the mistake, on our part, of neglecting the minds of men because we think so little of them.

Mr. President, we in the United States look forward very shortly to spending a billion dollars a week for armaments. How do we arrive at that figure of a billion dollars a week? We do so by listening to the generals and the admirals testify about what the Russians are doing in connection with the Russian armament program. That is why I am advancing these arguments today, as applied to this other and potentially even more potent weapon in our contest with the Soviet Union. Although we look forward very shortly to spending a billion dollars a week for armaments, we propose to spend only a million dollars—plus for ideas. Such an arrangement is enormously, foolishly, and tragically out of balance.

The Soviet emphasis upon youth has been increasingly manifest. Children hardly out of their cradles are indoctrinated with hate-America poison. A Chinese children's magazine, for example, tells its youthful readers:

Of course, you know the Japanese devils who ruled and oppressed our northeast for 14 years. The American imperialists are the same, but more cruel.

This is the picture of America given these youngsters:

While thousands of American workers are without food or clothing, one big capitalist, who just died, has left 75,000,000 United States dollars to his little dog for which a big mansion was built and for which 45 servants are employed. This, in spite of the fact that in America many labor families of eight have only 200 United States dollars per year. The fate of United States children is even more tragic. A lot of them work at hard labor when very young. Many die because of cold and hunger. Education is out of the question and there are 6,000,000 American children who are uneducated.

These youngsters are assured that the American system is doomed. Just wait a little while, they are told, and "Father" Stalin will fix the wicked American capitalists who starve their workers, work children to death and, but for "Father" Stalin, would import their evil system into China.

Papa Stalin is portrayed to these youngsters as the giver of all good things—the protector and the champion of all good. According to a West Berlin newspaper, *Telegraf*, the children of East Germany are saying a little bedtime prayer that goes something like this:

Fold your little hands, close your little eyes, think a minute about Stalin.

The equivalent of this prayer is being taught children throughout the Russian-dominated world. At this moment, even as I speak now, there are literally thousands of little ones folding their hands, closing their eyes, and thinking, God help them, of the man they are being taught to reverence in the place of God.

Mr. President, these are only children. But our children, a few years hence, will live in the adult world with these indoctrinated enemies.

For the older boys and girls in China the Communists have introduced a nice little game. Peiping students have a good time at rifle ranges where, in large characters, the invitation "Shoot Truman" bids them try their skill at a large target bearing the picture of our American President. Another game offered Chinese youth is called "smash the aggressor" and the target this time is an American soldier.

We cannot talk of youth without considering the recent show in East Berlin. High Commissioner McCloy estimated for me the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic annual budget for youths in East Germany at \$200,000,000. This mass gathering of 2,000,000 young people was publicized as the Third World Festival of Youths and Students for Peace. Basically it was a gigantic demonstration against the United States and for the Soviet. The official slogans are revealing. Here are a few of them:

Long live the U. S. S. R., the invincible bulwark of peace in the world.

Long live Stalin, the champion of peace in the world.

Peace-loving youth of France and Germany unite in the fight against remilitarization of West Germany.

German youth unite against remilitarization, for the preservation of peace, for the restoration of the unity of Germany.

We want lasting peace. Therefore, away with Adenauer.

Mr. President, I suggest that my colleagues make a point of seeing the newsreel of this Berlin gathering. Look at the faces of these young people. Their hate for the United States will terrify them. Now I do not blame these young people. But I suggest that if we feel we cannot afford to try to give these young people a different viewpoint, we are sowing the seeds of potential disaster. Yes, to be sure they are not easily accessible. They are behind the iron curtain. But all curtains, even iron ones, can be pierced. It is our business to learn how to pierce this one if we are not later to pay the same sum of \$115,000,000 in 20 minutes of blood and bullets.

The Soviets have seized upon the peace theme and, wherever possible, have

made it their own. The partisans of peace have duped millions—according to their claims, which I do not believe—including 13,500,000 Americans. This 3-year-old organization now claims as members more than one-third of the human race.

The partisans have been worth every kopek the Soviet Government has spent on them. In the minds of many millions the partisans have established the belief that the Soviet Government really wants peace, and that the United States is the chief obstacle to peace—and this in a world sick for peace, a world willing to pay any price but slavery for peace.

More and more, the partisans are behaving like the old Communist International. They follow the same pattern of disclaiming any connection with the Soviet Government, but at the same time the organization has become a roof under which have gathered the international organizations controlled by Moscow. Separate organizations have been set up for trade-unionists, women, young people, farmers, journalists, and professional people. In non-Soviet countries efforts have been made to negotiate united fronts with non-Communists.

The campaign has been given full support in the Communist and fellow-traveler press. It has radio support wherever the Voice of Moscow or that of any of its stooges penetrates.

The so-called peace offensive of the U. S. S. R., of course, is basically designed to stamp the United States as a warmonger and aggressor. We are said to be ruled by the greedy men of Wall Street, and we are pictured as being inevitably imperialistic. To document its charges of United States aggressive and warlike intent, the Soviet points to the policies which we have evolved to protect ourselves and the free world: Korea, the North Atlantic Pact, the mutual defense program, the mutual security program, our American bases in foreign countries, our military budget, and so on.

On the Far East, the United States is portrayed by Moscow in terms of colonial imperialism. The United States is attacked as the successor of the former colonial powers, Britain, France, and the Netherlands, and is charged with using its postwar economic power to supplant them in their former colonies.

These are persuasive arguments in the east. Let us not deceive ourselves. They are very compelling. It will take time and patience and money on our part to persuade the majority of Asiatics of our true intent.

By contrast, the U. S. S. R. is hailed as the defender of the oppressed peoples. They claim that the U. S. S. R. has solved the problem of racial minorities. They claim that their own record is proof of what underdeveloped lands and peoples can do if they now follow the Soviet doctrine and submit to Soviet domination.

The extent of Soviet propaganda in Asia staggers the imagination. Let me give you a few over-all figures on their North Korean campaign alone—directed at the 9,000,000 North Koreans. In June



of last year, an estimated 50,000 to 75,000 persons were employed full time or part time in this North Korean propaganda machine. An estimated 10 to 15 percent of the national budget of North Korea was planned in 1950 for propaganda purposes, much of it either directly or indirectly through the educational system.

By virtue of its magnitude and through its virtual monopoly over all means of communications, the North Korean campaign was highly effective, particularly among the so-called elite groups which were subjected to more intensive indoctrination. Even among the masses, however, the campaign went over, fixing a number of stereotypes almost indelibly upon their consciousness—such as imperialistic America and democratic Soviet Union.

If the Soviet Union were the only country which sent out the Communist "hate America" propaganda, our problem would be serious enough. However, the Kremlin is not the only source. In addition to broadcasts from political parts of the Soviet Union, such as the Ukraine, the Soviet Central Asian People's Republics, and the Baltic States, Communist radio stations in every satellite country such as Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Albania, Rumania, and Eastern Germany are daily broadcasting the same anti-American line.

In the Far East the situation is the same. Radio broadcasts from Communist stations in North Korea, China, and Indochina are covering Asia with hate-America propaganda. And in the Philippines, the Communist Huks are broadcasting the same line.

In the free world Communist Party members sing the anti-America song with pamphlets, posters, speeches, and through controlled Communist newspapers.

Literally it might be said that the United States has to defend itself against Communist propaganda from all areas of the free world whenever American policy comes into conflict with the policy of any particular country. This might be true in Iran over the oil issue, in Egypt, and other Arab States over some particular issue, or in the Malay States over rubber or tin. It is often true in Argentina.

Mr. President, perhaps others noticed an article which appeared recently in the Washington Post, based on a dispatch from Argentina, describing a Peronista meeting which was held a day or two before then. I read from that article:

Violently anti-American posters appeared during the rally describing the United States as the world's most criminal nation.

Mr. President, although today I am emphasizing the Russian situation, our great position of wealth and power excites envy all over the world, and the problem is not confined to the Russians.

Thus it is clear that American propaganda is having to wage a constant battle 24 hours a day in every corner of the world to protect the American position.

In China today the propaganda program is the major domestic assignment of the Chinese Communist Party. In terms of the proportionate effort expended, and volume of material poured out, it is on a par with the North Korean campaign which I have just described. The program is all-pervasive and all-inclusive, and colors every public act of the regime. It involves the full time of at least 1,000,000 people, and involves additional millions of people on a part-time basis. It has complete control of all media—radio, press, publishing, education, motion pictures, drama, music, art, and science.

Consider this: The New China News Agency—NCNA—claims to have published, during the first 6 months of 1950, 95,000,000 copies of books and 14,000,000 copies of magazines, as well as 624 newspapers. In addition, 140,000,000 elementary school and middle-school textbooks were made available to Chinese students. As of June 1950, there were 84 radio stations in operation, and their range was being extended by use of loud speakers in urban areas and by an extensive network of village monitors charged with spreading daily propaganda. Films, plays, "living newspapers," dramatic skits of current events, posters, wall bulletin boards, and story tellers were used to further extend the range of the program.

Propaganda agents are sent into even the most remote villages. Rallies, parades, and just plain uncamouflaged propaganda meetings are staged with increasing frequency.

The Peiping regime directs a propaganda barrage toward neighboring countries, particularly those in southeast Asia where large communities of Chinese live. The Chinese International Broadcasting Service broadcasts 12 hours and 55 minutes daily in 14 different languages. In addition, the Chinese propaganda bureau conducts a program of educational and cultural work in the field, subsidizing newspapers in Chinese and local languages, and widely distributing printed material of all sorts.

Communist propaganda is conducted on a large scale in India directly from the U. S. S. R. and through Indian dupes of the Communist International. Since the first of this year, both the Soviets and the Chinese have stepped up their campaign in India, making use of all propaganda media.

In November 1950, the Soviet radio was beaming to India 3 hours and 30 minutes daily of programs in Bengal, 10 hours and 30 minutes in English, and 1 hour and 45 minutes in Hindustani. Recently it has been reported that programs have been added or will be added in four additional languages used in India.

Communist publications in India range from elaborately prepared and printed volumes of Lenin's works down through journals, pamphlets, reports, and reprints, to propaganda leaflets which center their fire on attacks on America. Many of the leaflets are distributed free; others are sold for a trifling sum.

In addition to the numerous book-stalls where Communist literature is sold,

innumerable organizations and reading rooms act as agents, and Communist peddlers sell the material on the streets.

Mr. President, I have said that the Communist propaganda program in Asia staggers the imagination. I have merely touched briefly on a few of its high spots.

Always a major theme of the propaganda everywhere throughout the world is "Hate America"—America the enemy, the enemy of all so-called democratic peoples. In Europe the Soviets play upon the understandable pride of the Europeans. A few years ago the Marshall plan was portrayed as an attempt to enslave the Europeans. The mutual assistance program is being painted in the same colors. I do not doubt that the mutual security program will be given the same treatment.

We Americans, so the Soviets tell the Europeans, will involve them in another war. The Soviets say that we are using the Europeans to save our own hides, and that the Russians offer peace.

Informed sources estimate that the Soviets and the French Communist Party are currently investing about \$30,000,000 in propaganda in France alone. Of this, the major portion is obviously borne by Moscow, since the French Communist Party's total annual budget is only \$14,000,000.

The cultural and moral climate of the United States is pictured as materialistic, degenerate, pornographic, and generally on a gangster level. The organ of Soviet youth, Komsomolskaya Pravda, on January 14, 1950, described the corruption of American youth in the following terms:

An inalienable feature of the American way of life is the wide distribution of crime and its steady growth. In this regard the United States of America unquestionably occupies one of the first places in the world. American statistics reckon that in the United States of America during 1948 a serious crime was committed every 18.7 seconds, while in Los Angeles there was an average of one murder every 5 minutes 7 seconds. Crime among youth is especially great. High-school students form bands which go on drunken orgies, smoke opium, and cultivate all kinds of depravity. Theft, banditry, and murders multiply every day. Such a striking development of crime is explained not only by the fact that the American way of life, which permits the prosperity of unscrupulous businessmen, dooms millions of people to a starved existence and deprives them of work and the opportunity of getting an education. The growth of crime among youth is a consequence of that colossal job of corrupting young people which is being carried on by the ideologists of the American bourgeoisie.

The whole gigantic propaganda machine of the American imperialists serves the cause of corrupting youth. Capitalist monopolies exercise absolute control over all the American press with the exception of a few progressive publications. The film industry and the radio are also as a whole completely in the hands of the monopolies. Thanks to the care of the monopolists, the literary calling is being converted into a kind of business. Special agencies develop and deal in standardized subjects for detective, pornographic, mystery and other novels, novelettes and short stories. Standardized literary products as a whole fill the book market, leaving almost no place for classic literature. The bookshelves of the stores are filled for the most part with detective



and pornographic works, whose authors relish descriptions of murders and sexual and similar perversions. The favorite heroes of this literature are gangsters.

The whole operation of training American youth is aimed at corrupting the broad popular masses and at diverting them from political struggle.

Writing on Americanism in the *Communist Journal*, Ilya Ehrenberg declared:

Americanism personifies vulgarity and arrogance—robots and chewing gum, fornication in an automobile and a Negro soaked in petrol; supermen who crush skulls, frame-up of Communists, hypocrisy and savagery, talk of peace and the atom bomb; it is greed, falsehood and fear \* \* \*. In America they have their own brand of fascism, known by the name of Americanism.

All this, of course, is old stuff; but the important fact which we must not forget is that unless we combat such statements with the truth, they may well spell defeat for all our efforts to build the security of the free world.

Actually, however, I would not have our campaign of truth devote itself solely or even primarily to denying such allegations. Prof. Ralph Barton Perry, of Harvard University, said recently in the *New York Times*:

Above all, I would have this Voice speak for, and not against. Nothing is to be gained by thinking and talking in negative terms. So far have our anti-Russianism and anti-communism gone that even freedom has come to mean only something which the Russians do not have and which communism cannot give. Unless it has a positive message for the world—a message that will seem positive because it promises to satisfy existing needs and fulfill existing hopes, and by action as well as by words, the Voice of America might as well remain silent.

Here, I think, is indicated the proper role for our American information campaign. Indeed, Mr. President, we should go all-out for such a truth campaign, beginning, I should like to say, by voting in favor of my amendment which calls for a \$115,000,000 appropriation.

However, if my amendment is rejected, I call on my colleagues in the Senate to support the able leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] in his effort to have the Senate reject the committee amendment, so that the figure will at least remain at the \$85,000,000 appropriation voted by the House of Representatives.

Here is our own positive bid for understanding and for peace. If the peoples of the rest of the world learn that we in America want peace, and discover that we sympathize with their own legitimate aspirations to improve themselves and, indeed, that we will help them achieve their legitimate goals, we can hope that they will turn their faces toward us and will join with us in our faith in freedom and in our domestic ideals.

Mr. President, I have a resolution before the Foreign Relations Committee, calling for a full and complete study of this area in the conduct of our foreign policy, including its organization and structure. Except for one morning, the hearings on this resolution were delayed and held up by the MacArthur hearings, and then, subsequently, by the trip

of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee to Europe.

I am glad to tell the Senate that my senior colleague from Connecticut, only this week, has assured me that he hopes to hold hearings on this resolution within the next 2 weeks, and from these hearings I hope that information will be developed, which will give the Senate more knowledge of the achievements of the program, of the failures of the program, of its potential promise as a constructive force for peace, operating urgently and importantly, and of the best form of organization for its further development.

Yes, Mr. President, America has a big story to tell. That is our faith in a future world community based on peace and justice. Here, I think, is merchandise worthy of our great past, and a challenge to our future. Money invested in this area now, in the coming critical year, in my judgment will pay dividends not only in the present but for many, many decades ahead.

Let us by all means continue at once with our efforts to improve the program. I hope that many Senators, such as the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is on the floor as acting minority leader, will express their views to the Foreign Relations Committee during this investigation, called for by my resolution, Senate Resolution 74. But in the meantime, Mr. President, let our voice—the Voice of America—continue to be heard throughout the world. I urge an affirmative vote on my amendment restoring the \$115,000,000 for the program as worked out by the State Department and recommended by the President and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks four news stories. The first is an article by Drew Middleton, of the *New York Times*, which, together with the column commenting on it, written by the brilliant and versatile Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick, describes the terrifying impact of the Russian propaganda on the youth movement in Germany as recently dramatized by the 2,000,000 young Germans in East Berlin. I ask that both of these articles be printed in the *RECORD* at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

**"VOICE" URGED TO UNDERMINE SOVIET MORALE IN GERMANY—UNITED STATES OFFICIALS IN BONN SUGGEST PROGRAMS DIRECTED AT RUSSIAN TROOPS IN FIELD**

(By Drew Middleton)

BONN, GERMANY, August 21.—One of the most noticeable gaps in the propaganda effort directed by the United States at the Soviet Union and its satellites is the lack of any propaganda by radio or leaflet directed exclusively at the morale of the officers and men of the Soviet group of armies in East Germany.

The failure thus far of the United States propaganda to take advantage of the proximity to West Berlin and West Germany of nearly 400,000 Russian troops, the largest group of Russians living outside the frontiers of the Soviet Union, has aroused the concern of a number of officials here.

At the moment this concern is heightened by the knowledge that the troops are in maneuver areas where there are fewer restraints on their physical freedom in barracks and that, according to reports reaching West Germany, there has been considerable grumbling among the officers and men because of a rigorous new disciplinary code, including a ban on drinking, imposed by Gen. Vassily I. Chuikov, Soviet commander in Germany.

#### OCCASIONAL BROADCASTS MADE

Occasionally, the Voice of America includes some items that concerns the Soviet army of occupation more than it does the Soviet people as a whole.

An example was the "Voice's" efforts last April to give the widest possible circulation to a statement by John J. McCloy, United States High Commissioner, that in Germany the United States would not return to the Soviet Union or its satellites political refugees whose lives and freedoms would be jeopardized by such return.

But there is no steady overt appeal by radio or leaflets directed at the Soviet group of armies, a group whose morale is probably as important to the Russians as that of the United States Seventh Army and the British Army of the Rhine is to the west.

Some officials suggest that the Voice of America broadcasts to the Soviet Union and the programs of RIAS [the United States radio station] in West Berlin directed in German to East Germany do all that is needed.

But propaganda experience in World War II showed that an army in the field is most affected by propaganda that is specifically devoted to that army, its grouches, and its shortcomings.

An army's morale seldom is weakened by attacks on the political system it represents, but it is affected when it learns through propaganda that a potential enemy knows, just as every enlisted man in that army knows, that despite the praise lavished on it by his own propagandists, a certain piece of equipment is junk.

#### BERLIN WEAKNESS CALLED FACTOR

There is considerable reticence in official quarters about why no such propaganda is directed at the Soviet group of armies. Its absence may be explained, however, by the precarious hold the Western Allies have on West Berlin and the peculiar vulnerability of the three western sectors to Soviet or East German pressure.

Direct propaganda to the Soviet occupation army might produce a new Russian stranglehold on Berlin. This argument is frequently raised but it strikes many observers as being beside the point.

If the Russians decide to make another great effort to drive the Allies out of West Berlin—and there are indications that to complete their consolidation of East Germany into the Soviet system they will have to do just that—they will have to delay the effort until two important pieces of construction are finished.

The first of these is a railroad circle around the entire city enabling the Russians to route trains around Berlin without too much trouble. This circle will be finished by January 1952.

The second construction project is a canal now being dug that will free the Russians of the present necessity of sending barge traffic through waterways that lie in the British sector of the city. The canal will be finished by the end of 1952.

When both the railroad circle and the canal are completed, the Russians no longer will be dependent on the western powers for a right-of-way through Berlin by rail or canal.

"Then and only then will we get real pressure," one of the most experienced of allied officials in Berlin said recently. "But never



underestimate their desire to drive us out of the city."

#### RUSSIAN COMMAND SENSITIVE

This official said the Russians certainly would move against Berlin but their timetable would not be altered by the appearance of any new propaganda.

As a result of its experience in the first 18 months of the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union, when desertion both by individuals and in the mass was high, the Russian high command is peculiarly sensitive to propaganda directed at its soldiers.

But if there is a risk attached to the introduction of this sort of propaganda, there would be obvious gains.

A minimum gain would be that the morale of the Russian Army, at very least as important a factor in Soviet calculations as the submissiveness of the east German population, might be weakened.

There are a few students of Soviet psychology who go further. They believe that an intensive propaganda campaign directed at these soldiers in the long run might be a factor in forcing the Russians to consider the withdrawal of their troops at least out of the forward areas of their occupation zone and from an area around Berlin.

These sources note that the withdrawal of the Russian armies eastward has been a primary objective of United States foreign policy since 1945, but that up to date no progress has been made.

They consider the difficulties of getting through to the Soviet personnel, especially the private soldiers, but they believe that the result would be worth all the risks and trouble involved.

#### ABROAD—COMMUNIST YOUTH AT THE WESTERN SHOW WINDOW

(By Anne O'Hare McCormick)

Why did the Soviet Government give the flower of the youth of East Germany and other satellites an opportunity to see and communicate with the west? This was the question left hanging in the air as the last rocket exploded in the fireworks display that ended the Communist Youth Festival in East Berlin. Legions of hand-picked boys and girls, the elite on whom Moscow depends for blind allegiance and leadership, were deliberately brought to the one place within the Soviet orbit where the window opens on the outside world.

All the witnesses agree that the rally was an impressive manifestation of Soviet power to organize and dramatize crowds. The Communist impresarios spared no effort or expense to stage a propaganda show which in noise, color, and size would dwarf the pale performances of the democracies. The contrast between the thundering march-to-order of the millions in Berlin and the quiet, serious, give-and-take discussions of the World Assembly of Non-Communist Youth held simultaneously on the campus of Cornell University is too suggestive to be ignored.

The Communists are tireless in whipping up mass demonstrations. They work day and night to mold to their pattern the plastic minds of the young. The vast convergence of youth delegations in Berlin required almost as much organization as a military call-up. Indeed it was so like a military mobilization that it makes rather academic the questions that disturb and darken the world: Will there be war? or When will war start?

#### THE RUSSIAN KIND OF WARFARE

This is war. The Russians have long been waging their own kind of warfare. They flaunt their potential manpower in Berlin because that abnormal city is the battlefield of this new type of conflict, as decisive in its way as the classic clash of armies. Unlike the rest of us the Soviet Union did not scat-

ter its military forces when the shooting stopped, but just as significant as its continued mobilization is the fact that up to now it has used troops only as a threat in the background. All its postwar conquests have been gained by the use of weapons which the Western World has been slow either to counter or adopt.

It took the Communist youth in Berlin to show us one of our most effective weapons. For while the scale and drama of the rally impressed the reporters, the most impressive thing brought out in the reports is the curiosity of the young from the Soviet world to see what life is like in the west.

The West Berlin authorities estimated that 1,200,000 participants crossed over to the western sectors in the course of the festival. The West Berliners served more than 900,000 meals to the visitors. The hungry young guests were goggle-eyed over the abundance they saw. They were astonished at the goods displayed in the shop windows, at the kindness they encountered, at the difference between the Americans of the Soviet legend and the Americans they met (including High Commissioner McCloy), and above all by the freedom with which people talked. "It's another world, all right," sighed one boy.

West Berlin is one of the most shattered and straitened towns in Europe. That it looked like a glamour city to the sightseers from the east is the best comment on the drabness and scarcity on the Soviet side of the line. Why, then, was the iron curtain lifted for these impressionable young people? Apparently not much effort was made by the Communist leaders to keep them out of the western zone.

#### THE SHOW OF POWER

The leaders must have figured that their show of power over the youth would influence and frighten West Germany more than exposure to the west would affect the visitors from the east. Last year the Communists brought 500,000 youth to Berlin, and the decision to bring four times that number to this year's rally is pretty convincing proof that the managers of the show consider that on balance they gain more than they lose by the exhibit.

Whether they are right or wrong is a matter of conjecture. To many observers it seemed significant that the proportion of visitors to West Berlin was much greater this year than last, and that their comments on what they saw and on the "lies" they had been fed were franker and more general. It cannot be assumed that the Communist chiefs do not fear comparison and contact with the outer world; the iron curtain was forged to keep people from looking out or in. Probably popular discontent does no worry rulers of police states; they count on the helplessness of the people to oppose or escape their control.

The crux of the matter is that to the Russians, Berlin is a battlefield in a war. They came back to the attack in greater force this year than last partly to parade their own strength in East Germany, partly to test the resistance of West Germany, partly to remind us that they never stop trying. What is important is that the Western Powers recognize the maneuver for what it is, and fight back with equal persistence. In a dispatch in another column of *The Times*, Drew Middleton calls attention to the failure of the United States to direct propaganda to the 400,000 Russian troops stationed in East Germany. The surprise of the youth who exclaimed at the sights in West Berlin is surely a sign that we have likewise failed to open the eyes of the East German young, even to the material benefits of a free society.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* an editorial entitled "Mutiny on the Baltic," from the Chi-

cago Sun-Times of June 5, 1951, and an article entitled "United States Steps Up Courtship of Russian People," which appeared in the Washington Post, July 29, 1951, and which I gather is based on an Associated Press dispatch.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### MUTINY ON THE BALTIC

The Voice of America is penetrating the Communist iron curtain and getting results. That's the encouraging news brought by 16 Polish sailors who mutinied against a Red mine sweeper's officers and sailed to Sweden—and freedom.

The mutineers said they were inspired by recent United States and British broadcasts advising prisoners of the Red terror to get away from communism by fleeing to Sweden.

This was the second mutiny aboard a Communist ship on the Baltic Sea within a fortnight. Earlier, on July 19, three Lithuanians locked up Russian crew members of a trawler and escaped to Sweden. In addition to those two mutinies, four young Poles—one a woman—made an escape from Poland in a makeshift plane and landed in southern Sweden.

These incidents may be straws in the wind. Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia says Russia fears a revolt in Poland and is taking steps to prevent it.

The Voice of America undoubtedly is helping the Poles keep up their traditional independent spirit. The Voice is making plenty of trouble for the Kremlin masters. This is all part of the battle for the minds and hearts of men President Truman referred to last spring when he made a special plea for \$97,000,000 to build a network of Voice of America stations on the Continent of Europe.

Congress reduced the figure to a measly \$9,500,000. The House Appropriations Committee said that the Voice was inefficient and had no concrete plans to get America's message behind the iron curtain. Congressmen ought to talk to some of the refugees from behind the iron curtain about that. They'd get a better idea about the importance of the war of ideas that is an essential part of this twentieth century conflict between slavery and freedom.

#### UNITED STATES STEPS UP COURTSHIP OF RUSSIAN PEOPLE (By Clarke Beach)

America's campaign to get past Stalin to talk truth and friendship to his people is getting bigger all the time. And it is no hopeless gesture, in the opinion of many Russian experts, who say the Soviet Union is not the solidly united state the Communists picture.

None of the experts is expecting revolution in Russia soon, but they say that if America and her Western Allies convince the Soviet people that they are their friends, many of those people some day, in peace or war, will side with the West against their Bolshevik masters.

The strongest, warmest message to the Russian people came early in July from Congress and the President. A resolution and a message, sent to N. M. Shvernik, President of the Soviet Presidium, expressed the admiration of Americans for the Soviet people and the assurance that America wants only peace.

The Voice of America broadcast it to Soviet listeners twice an hour, day and night, for 3 days.

In the past 3 months, the Voice has added seven new Soviet languages to its program. It used to broadcast only in Russian, Lithuanian and Ukrainian. Now it speaks also in Georgian, Estonian, Latvian, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Tartar and Turkestan.



The Voice wanted the Uzbek language, but the State Department could find only one man who could speak Uzbek and was otherwise qualified. Each language program needs 3 or 4 persons, so the Department settled for Turkestan—which can be understood by many Uzbeks.

The reason the Voice wants to talk to the Uzbeks is that the Soviet Government makes tall claims about Uzbekistan's being a model Soviet republic. This Government has reason to believe that the Uzbeks are unhappy about many things, such as:

Like all the other central Asiatic Soviet republics in the Caspian Sea area, they are being governed and exploited by Russians—carpetbaggers.

Few native Uzbeks are permitted to hold government jobs.

The Uzbek cotton industry is managed by an agency which has no responsibility to local authorities.

The number of Uzbek industrial workers has decreased since the war.

Little attention is paid to education for the Uzbeks.

Experts consider the central Asiatic republics the soft underbelly of the Soviet Union. The Bolsheviks apparently think so, too. They are moving hordes of natives out of the area and replacing them with Russians.

The effort of the Voice today is to drive a wedge between the Soviet people and the Politburo. It doesn't waste much thunder on the aging Stalin. The enduring enemy is the Politburo, the core of the Soviet dictatorship.

The theme of the pro-Soviet people, anti-Soviet government policy is not new among Russian experts, but it is just now winning general acceptance.

The State Department is now at work on a plan to ring the Communist world with radio stations that will reach into every corner of the Red empire. It will cost almost \$150,000,000. Congress has authorized it but has appropriated only \$42,000,000 so far.

Broadcast from the United States and other western allies are about the only means of getting truthful information into Russia. That the people are hearing them is obvious from the many speeches and articles by Russian leaders denouncing the Voice. A German newspaper recently carried a report from Kuibyshev that three Russians were executed for listening to the Voice.

The shakiness of the Soviet structure is detected in many ways.

In the bizarre "agitator" system, for instance, is seen the Bolsheviks' frantic struggle to keep their subjects in line. Alex Inkeles, of the Russian Research Center at Harvard University, says the Soviet government maintains a force of about 2,000,000 agitators in Moscow, one for every 30 inhabitants. Their job is to continually exhort the workers to stand firmly behind the Communists, and work harder and harder.

The lot of the agitator is not a happy one. Most of them, says Inkeles, try to get rid of the job as quickly as possible. The workers resent them, and the government never is satisfied with their efforts.

A résumé of the tensions within the Soviet Union was prepared recently for Congress under the direction of Dr. Sergius Yakobson, of the Library of Congress. Here are some things he reports:

Open, large-scale resistance has occurred among the Baltic republics, where Soviet exploitation has been unrestrained.

For nationalistic reasons, the Ukraine has been seething with discontent since 1920. Multitudes have been killed there, but there are reports that resistance is once again becoming strong.

Only 7 of the 175 nationalities in the Soviet Union have ever been represented in the Politburo.

Whole nations have been exterminated or transported when Moscow became nervous about their loyalty.

The Jews are finding themselves increasingly subjected to anti-Semitism. The government is violently anti-Zionist. Yakobson says the Jews certainly constitute an area of acute tension.

The government shows deepest hostility to the Moslems, too.

Despite the government's long and bitter fight against religion—the Russian Orthodox Church in particular—official Soviet figures show that one-third of the adults in the cities and two-thirds of those in the villages are church members.

Purges and bitter public attacks on scientists, writers, and other intelligentsia prove that the government has never been able to make them settle down happily under the Red yoke.

The Red army is constantly under suspicion and surveillance lest it win the allegiance of the people and take over the government.

Women, far from enjoying sex equality as the Soviets boast, take relatively little part in government or the professions. Many do perform a man's hard labor.

The peasants have long been considered black sheep because of their persistent resistance to collectivization of farming.

Friends and relatives of the tens of millions of persons who have been herded off into slave labor camps must constitute a formidable group of malcontents, in Yakobson's opinion.

Mr. BENTON. Finally, Mr. President, I have a most interesting and informative three-page statement from Edwin F. Stanton, American Ambassador to Thailand, giving his comments on this program, which I shall not read, but which I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF EDWIN F. STANTON, AMERICAN  
AMBASSADOR TO THAILAND

It is my deep conviction that the activities of USIE constitute not only one of the most effective means of explaining to the peoples of the world what the ideals of freedom and democracy mean both in theory and practice to the citizens of this country, but also that they constitute a most potent weapon in our battle against the Communists' vicious and widespread propaganda.

To win the minds of man by words of truth, reason and persuasion is far less costly in terms of precious American lives and treasure than to attempt to stamp out doctrines of aggression and tyranny by the sword. This is exactly what USIE is doing—winning minds from communism and encouraging other to stand fast. But USIE can do more. It can have even great success if given greater support by the Congress and the people. Every mind won from communism through the activities of USIE may mean the lives of American boys spared.

I have seen for myself and am proud to have had a part in the success of USIE activities in Thailand. As you know, particularly those Members of the Congress who have visited Thailand, that little country because of its geographical location in Asia, its economic importance as a great producer and exporter of rice, and its unique history of independence in an area of colonial exploitation, occupies a key position in the present struggle between the forces of freedom and communism. "Thai" means free and the Thai people's love of freedom has not only manifested itself in the struggles of its people, in the past, to maintain their freedom but recently has found expression in

the sending of prompt and substantial aid to Korea in the form of troops, rice and gunboats. They have supported the United States position in important issues before the UN. They have given us moral support and such material aid as their limited resources have made possible. I feel that the Thai people are among our best friends in Asia.

I regard the Information and Educational Exchange program of our Government as one of the essential and most effective instruments available to our Embassy in Thailand in encouraging the Thai Government and people to stand fast and to defend their freedom against the ominous threat of communism. Their and our enemies are powerful and vociferous. The Chinese press in Thailand is almost wholly Communist controlled. This press speaks to 3,000,000 people in Thailand, the largest overseas Chinese minority in any country in the world. It blasts at the United States daily and seeks to discredit us in the minds of the Thai people. To counter this flood of poison our Embassy, through the USIE office, issues daily in Chinese to all Chinese newspapers, the only factual and free news service in the country. The majority of these daily releases are published in one or more Chinese newspapers—even in some of those controlled by the Communists.

The USIE daily news service, news letters on agricultural and educational topics and special magazines in the Thai language go out to every Thai newspaper in the country, to Government officials, and to leading citizens in schools, hospitals, and agricultural centers throughout the 72 Provinces. I do believe that among these people the Communist line cannot go long undetected nor the trend of world events be hidden. There is a thirst among the Thai people not only for reliable news but also for cultural and technical information. This avid desire and need is being met by USIE within the limits of available funds and personnel.

I have seen the particularly effective results of the augmented USIE programs in Thailand over the past 2 years. The additional staff and services provided by the Congress have enabled us for the first time directly and indirectly to counter the vitriolic Communist propaganda in Thailand. We have encouraged the Thai Government in their own efforts to combat communism and strengthen democratic forces among the people. We are the only foreign government that has been asked and is producing local radio programs for broadcast over the Thai Government radio; at their request we are collaborating in the preparation of special motion pictures, made in Thailand for the Thai people; we have provided United States motion pictures and projection equipment for showing in remote villages in the crucial northeast area of Thailand along the Indochinese border; we have been able to stimulate the influential Buddhist priesthood of Thailand in the preparation of materials requested by them to show the dangers of communism to a Buddhist society; we were prepared to act promptly in concert with the Thai Government to reveal the true nature of the Communist Stockholm peace pledge and to see them carry through a genuine Buddhist peace campaign among the Thai people.

In short, the fact that the Thai Government and people have been coming to us for ideas and techniques, "ammunition" in other words, for their battle against Communist influence within their borders, is clear evidence of the effectiveness and success of USIE activities in Thailand. I sincerely believe therefore that the money spent for American personnel and informational activities within Thailand is a highly profitable investment in democracy. As our Government's representative in Thailand since 1946 I have found the USIE programs in-



dispensable to the implementation of our political objective of helping Thailand to maintain her freedom and her independence.

Therefore on the basis both of conviction and experience, I urge the giving of additional encouragement and support to USIE so that it may win the many by a persuasive appeal to their minds and thus spare to our Nation its precious sons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada desire to use any time? The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this amendment calls for \$115,000,000, whereas the committee allowed \$63,000,000. The House allowed only \$85,000,000. I cannot believe that the Senate of the United States would approve this amendment. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I desire to say to my good friend from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] that I do, with regret, oppose his amendment, and at the same time I want to say to my friend from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] that I am also opposed to the amendment, jointly sponsored, which would make the amount \$85,000,000. I think the committee has been generous indeed, and probably if the decision were left to me, it is doubtful whether under the circumstances I would have provided even the amount which is carried in the bill. In saying that, I do not mean that I am opposed to the Voice of America. It is here, and I think it is a permanent fixture in our national life. I believe World War II demonstrated the value of psychological warfare in wartime and in peacetime, and the measure which was passed by the Eighty-first Congress and which is now Public Law 402, makes it a permanent fixture. So it is here.

However, granting, of course, that it is going to be permanent, I believe it is all the more necessary that it receive infinitely better attention than it has received heretofore, because, if it is to be integrated into our national life, and if it is to be one of the vehicles for breaking down the will of our enemies and building the will of those who would be allied in our cause, then we had better be sure that the vehicle we have is good, that it is effective, that it is efficient, that it is well manned, and that it has the best kind of personnel.

The resolution which my good friend from Connecticut offered was for the purpose of having a hearing looking to the creation of an independent set-up for the Voice of America. I do not care to antedate or anticipate the Senator from Connecticut, but I was going to send to the desk a proposal which I have before me, which might be helpful in searching for the answer. It simply provides for an international informational and educational administration as an independent agency which is divorced from the State Department. The funds and the authority for this purpose which the Department have at the present time would be transferred to this independent group, which would not quite have

Cabinet status, but nearly so. I believe this is the only country in the world where those who shape the national policy also direct the propaganda of the country. If I am wrong in that statement, then, Mr. President, I shall be only too glad to stand corrected. But it seems to me that if it is a function, properly it must be an independent agency standing on its own, manned by persons who have a special talent and a particular capacity for doing the job.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. May I point out that in most of the other countries, indeed, in nearly all others that I know of, the operating agencies are separate from the foreign office.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. BENTON. But in all major powers with whose policy I am familiar the policy traces back to and emanates from the foreign office.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But this is a type of weapon which I think must be divorced from the policy-making branch of the Government, and it should not be directed or shaped, nor should its policy be colored, by the State Department.

Mr. President, I said at the outset that one of the weaknesses which I think we find in the Voice of America is that it has not been very objective. I do not think it has been very militant, as a matter of fact. I have taken the trouble to examine a good many of the scripts and the broadcasts which have been beamed on the air. I have one here which distresses me a little. This morning, in my own office, I said to one of the executives of the Voice of America that I could not understand why this sort of thing goes on because, in my judgment, it is not objective, it is not designed to break down the will of our enemy, and so to become a real auxiliary weapon, and it is not particularly designed to build up a confidence and an alliance with what we are pleased to call the American tradition.

This one was done on the 12th of February 1951. It was issued by the News Section, Dramatics Unit, and it addresses itself to Lincoln's Birthday. I shall give Senators but two paragraphs, which illustrate what I mean. The first announcer comes on, somewhere in the middle of this script, and says:

The War Between the States had a year and a half to run. In 1864 the American people reelected Lincoln President. Among the letters of congratulation that came to the White House was one from the International Workingmen's Association. It was written by Karl Marx.

Voice No. 2 comes on and says:

From the commencement of the titanic American strife the workingmen of Europe felt instinctively that the Star-Spangled Banner carried the destiny of their class. They consider it an event of the epoch that it fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln, the single-minded son of the working class, to lead the country through the matchless struggle for the rescue of an enchained race and the reconstruction of a social world.

Mr. President, that is not Lincoln to me—and I live where he lived long ago, in the same area of Illinois. Here is class

emphasis. Do we have to bring in Karl Marx, leave the inference that Lincoln was a disciple of Karl Marx, and beam that wherever there is a short-wave receiver in all the sections of the earth? Is that objectivity? Does that break down the resistance of those who have a difference with the American tradition? In my judgment, no, it does not. That is a waste of time, talent, and effort. The Voice of America knows it. I am not willing to lavish \$115,000,000 on that sort of thing. I have looked at many of these scripts. It is rather strange what they particularize when they make a comment on the news. I think they could diffuse it a little more and give a better picture. In my opinion, the whole objective must be reshaped in order to carry out the fundamental purpose. Was it not Clausewitz who said that war simply breaks down the resistance of the enemy? Propaganda breaks down resistance before the shooting begins. It must be directed to that sort of purpose. But that has not been the objective in any sense.

I think I could regale the Senate all afternoon with a great many of these broadcasts, but I shall not take the time. I want to say to my good friend from Connecticut that the purpose of my amendment is only to be helpful, because I share his conviction that the agency must be an independent one. We must have a new man at the top. His name should come before this body for confirmation, because it will never do to let things go out into the world which, instead of enhancing our cause, will weaken it.

I now submit the amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to say to my distinguished colleague from Illinois that I fully agree that the Voice of America has been disappointing to us, but, as I shall point out shortly in a very brief comment indicating why I shall support the House figure, I think, as a whole, we may have a different kind of program. I do not hesitate to say that if we do not get a different kind of program, I shall not vote for it any further, because I do not believe that, for the most part, it has accomplished what we had expected and what we had hoped, and what is necessary.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield me just one more minute?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I recognize that we have made the Voice of America a permanent institution and I do not want to be capricious or arbitrary about it. I do not desire to destroy it, but, on the other hand, I do not want to see money spent foolishly.

After all, Mr. President, there are only approximately 20,000 short-wave sets in China. Let us take a look at the world and try to shape it accordingly.



I should like to have some of the waste squeezed out. I do not think we should dump money into the program at negotiated prices when it can be done for half that amount. I yield to no one in my interest in doing this job and doing it well, but the waste has got to be squeezed out and the activity has got to represent the American viewpoint. Otherwise it can all be thrown into the Potomac River, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield the junior Senator from Arkansas half of that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 4 minutes.

#### STUDENT EXCHANGE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I appreciate the generosity of the Senator from Nevada. He knows I am supporting the amendment, but being the good sport he is, he is giving me 4 minutes.

There are one or two things I want to put into the RECORD. I particularly wish to invite attention to an excerpt from a recent publication by the editors of Fortune magazine. I do not think anyone believes that is a left-wing or New Dealish magazine. It is made up, I may say, of some of the most expert publicists, certainly the most successful people in the field of public relations.

I desire to read one short paragraph from page 227 of the book entitled "U. S. A.: The Permanent Revolution." The articles making up the book were published in Fortune magazine, and then later reduced to book form. I read:

We have a tremendous opportunity before us. We should seize it by expanding our total propaganda budget to at least \$500,000,000 a year—and of this devote at least \$180,000,000 to exchange. We could not legislate a bigger bargain for ourselves. For every Government dollar we put in the exchange kitty we stimulate at least two matching dollars from private groups here and organizations and governments on the other side. As a result, by priming the pump with \$180,000,000, we could step up the exchange to roughly 50,000 people a year to the United States; at least 10,000 in the other direction.

Mr. President, I think this short chapter, which contains only a few pages, is of such interest to readers of the RECORD that I ask unanimous consent to have it made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD. It discusses at a little greater length the same problem.

There being no objection, the chapter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### HAVE WE ANY FRIENDS?

If Americans can indeed find the means of implementing the right to life on the basis, primarily, of private initiative; if they can learn how to harness the energies of individual citizens all over the land for the solution to the social problems that so trouble the modern world, they will have made an enormous contribution to the evolution of freedom. Yet there is an axiom of American life that may not be disregarded without

dire consequences: Americans cannot successfully achieve their goals in a nationalistic vacuum. This axiom is inherent to the proposition itself, which, as we have so often stressed, is constructed of universal principles that are held to be common to all mankind. And in a purely pragmatic sense it is not conceivable that a free society in America could long endure, unless it were matched by its own kind, whether partners or competitors elsewhere throughout the world.

In other words, no matter how much progress may be made in solving domestic problems, the maintenance of freedom here is always intimately linked with problems and goals in the field of foreign relations. And this is not only a matter of foreign policy, as reviewed in the next chapter. It raises a relatively new but wholly critical problem in international understanding—that is to say, a problem of communications. It is not possible to achieve an orderly evolution of freedom unless the free peoples of the world know and understand what each is trying to do. In an atmosphere of understanding new ideas will flourish, and will be tested out in various ways, so that the most useful and best may survive. Where such understanding is lacking, however, new ideas are misunderstood; and may even be converted, through popular misconceptions, into monstrosities that appear to threaten those very ideas of freedom that they were designed to serve.

Such misunderstanding exists today on a frightening scale. It exists not only between Americans and Asiatics, where the natural differences that separate eastern and western viewpoints might be expected to bring it about. It exists, most unfortunately, and perhaps most dangerously, between America and the free world of Europe. For in Europe there has grown up a kind of myth about America, and it might one day be written that the free world destroyed itself because of it. It would not be the big lie of the Russians; only the fools believed that. It would be something much more inexplicable: the myth that for all our bathtubs and our cars and our skyscrapers we are without moral purpose; that we are the new Carthage—all money, no spirit; that we are, in short, a country without a soul.

If America does not destroy this myth, it will destroy America. For already it has sapped the will of our allies, made those who benefited from the ECA cynical of its purpose; and each month it grows more in virulence, ready to attack at each crisis. But even more terrible has been the effect on America herself. For when we hear the myth played back to us, we grow petulant and dismayed, and in our anger many of us can think of nothing but to pull down the pillars of a world that does not understand.

Yet the west is desperately eager to listen. That it tragically misunderstands us is not easily explained by the accusations that come so readily to American minds. Nor is it simply a matter of slicker gimmicks or extra kilowatts or more pamphlets. The failure is not technical; it is national. We have sold the world many things—sold them so well that half Europe would pack up and come over here if it could. But we have left unsold the ideas that would destroy the myth.

We talk of "A Campaign of Truth." This, certainly, is in order. But what is the truth—speeches, statistics, a day in the life of a Wisconsin farmer? Our congenital dislike of abstract thought has at last come home to roost. We have failed to determine what it is we wish to communicate. Once we knew very well what we were and what we wanted to be and we thought it out into some of the most contagious prose of all time. But we went on to become the great pragmatists, so eager to be on with the job, so impatient of theory and reflection, that we worked ourselves into a moral isolation-

ism. Why analyze America? It worked, didn't it?

Curiously, by keeping our philosophy so tacit, we have managed to show ourselves to the world as little different from the Marxists—seeming, like them, to believe that material prosperity is an end that in itself will bring all the other qualities. Instinctively we know better, but we have never bothered to articulate for ourselves what we take for granted, much less convey it to others. And so we have talked of the manifestations of our success rather than the causes. Not for us woolly-headed theories or impractical idealism; instead, down-to-earth, hard-rock facts: the miles of cement, the telephones, the cars laid end to end—all the things, in short, our friends have envied and our friends have conceded.

But what made the telephones and the cars possible? When we have tried to explain, it has been in a lazy man's shorthand that has obscured our national character rather than illuminated it. Thus have we prated of individualism, when we have achieved the most horizontal, cooperative of all societies; of competition and incentive economy, when we have achieved the kind of security that Socialists everywhere hunger for. And we wonder why the audience is confused.

And not only have we failed to define what we are to say; we have failed to define why we want to say it. Of all the many aims of our propaganda, which is to be primary? Interestingly, almost every private organization that has thought of an overseas propaganda program of its own has stumbled on precisely this question. More to the point, so has the Government.

What is the aim? Friendship? To many Americans this is the end-all. And nothing has done us more grievous harm—for we are offended terribly when love is not forthcoming from others. It is quite impossible anyway. We have only to look at India; since their departure, the British who never gave a damn whether anyone liked them or not, have become increasingly popular, while we, who did our best to expedite that departure, are becoming increasingly unpopular. The fruits of leadership do not necessarily include love, and we would do well to take the fact in our stride.

To Americanize people? No one ever puts it quite this baldly, but there lurks deep in some American breasts the feeling that there is a mystically beneficent quality in certain of our folkways, and that if only they could be exported, the chasm in understanding would be bridged. But in following this line we are indulging in a failure to isolate the particulars from the principles. After all, what was so Japanese as baseball?

To refute Communist lies? Obviously, this is an important part of any propaganda program, but as the primary aim it is a defensive course that would foredoom us to a constant shellacking. They will always be a lie ahead. Furthermore, we must recognize that anticommunism does not fill vacuums, nor is it necessarily pro-United States; indeed, our biggest problem lies in those people who think we are as bad as the Russians.

To enlist support for American foreign policy? This is generally considered the primary aim of our propaganda effort. Spelled out, it means stressing the mutuality of each country's interests with ours; thus have we pushed ECA, North Atlantic Pact aid, the idea of national freedom, survival of the west. Is it enough? These policies are so demonstrably in the common interest that by all standards of logic they should be galvanic. Yet they are not, and the very people the policies benefit view them with mistrust. Why do they? The fact that we must ask ourselves this question helps answer the other.



Clearly, something more dynamic is needed. It is too late for mere information. If we wish our proposition to survive we must now not only describe the revolution we began, we must extend it. And it is the Europeans themselves, as we shall see, who make the point.

The obstacles to success may seem appalling. For even when we have articulated our philosophy we have the task of projecting it over the tremendous gap in attitudes and environment that separates us from other people. And it is a gap, unfortunately, that we do not readily appreciate. We have been so unaware of basic differences that we have persisted in talking to the Europeans in terms for which there is no foreign equivalent: participation, community relations, incentive, public relations, productivity, man-in-the-street, public opinion—the very listing itself produces a syllabus of the American philosophy. And a glossary of misunderstanding. Taking the evocative power of these words for granted, we have assumed that hard facts will do the job—and that, in a sort of question-and-answer fashion, we can use prepackaged nuggets of truth to beat down each fallacy we come across. It won't work. Like the hydra, the myth is proof against piecemeal attack. Americans are barbarians. The United States is a dehumanizing technocracy. Here are the two chief elements in the myth—yet both are so mutually supporting that to refute either we must trace them back to their common source.

Europe today presents an odd paradox. While neutralism has been reduced politically—in the words of one observer—to a hard core of jerks, emotionally it has never been more powerful. Its underpinnings go something like this: since there is no spiritual base to the United States, it is as culturally barren as the U. S. S. R.; its people are barbarians, and any who must accept succor from them should hate themselves for it. The thesis, of course, is put much better than this. Essayists have a whole new lexicon of psychiatric and anthropological terms for the job, and they have been using it with increasing frequency to demonstrate that the jukebox, the milkshake, or some such thing is the universal clue to America's infantilism, reverted-uncle complex, kinoweltschmerz, etc.

The frightening thing is that it is the top intellectuals—the cream of Europe's professional class—who have convinced themselves most deeply. The bulk hate and fear Russia, yet the myth has so distorted their vision that, as one Frenchman has pointed out, what non-Communists seem to be fighting most is anticommunism. And this attitude, unfortunately, cannot be shrugged off as the affectation of a small coterie. The intellectual in Europe still retains a much more commanding position in society than his American counterpart. And though he has abdicated many of the responsibilities of his leadership, every poll and survey indicates that, if nothing else, he has been saying what the majority of his countrymen feel.

Why do they think us barbarians? First, because we paint ourselves as such. Few nations have put their worst foot so far forward; by our asinine emphasis on the material goodies, we have seemed, by implication, to deny the existence of anything else in American life worth bragging about. Even during the most desperate days of the war we got our message of hope so tangled up with refrigerators and cars that, as one OWI worker put it, we could have billed it as "The War That Refreshes." The commercial projection of America has gone a step further; while our information people spend millions trying to demonstrate that we are really cultural after all, the biggest information agency in the world, Hollywood, has been exporting films that seem to demon-

strate the opposite—so persuasively, it might be noted, that in Austria the Russians have been saving their breath by letting several of our gangster films quietly circulate in their occupation zone.

In their own way our intellectuals have joined in the chorus. How is the world to believe that there is any spiritual content in American life, the European asks, when American higher literature is so full of despair? In part, of course, the indictment is a misreading. Certainly America's literature is a long way from Whitman's ideal to report all heroism from the American viewpoint. Yet it is not quite so far as Europeans think, for they lack the context to see much of it for what it is—a self-criticism, a searching for values that in itself indicates a god bit of spiritual vitality in American life.

An appalling amount of our higher criticism, however, is a vituperation almost psychopathic in its intensity. The emptiness of our American life; bourgeois industrialism; the grand canyon of the big money; the dull horror of our lives. So goes the familiar litany. In part it is merely verbal revenge on a social structure that does not pay obeisance to the intellectual, and the European can sense it as such. What he does not realize, however, is that many of the critics have remained so unaware of the profound changes that have taken place in our society that they are still addressing themselves to the twenties—occasionally the 1890's.

But influential as our own self-criticisms may be, it would be a mistake to assign them a preponderant share in the formation of the myth. The myth reflects quite as much about the audience as about the United States; it is supposed to describe—and the fact, for example, that *Rage de Vivre* (originally, *Really the Blues*—all about marijuana, hot jazz, etc.) is currently a best-seller in Paris demonstrates nothing so much as the extraordinary affinity Europeans have developed for such stuff. Furthermore, their attitude has now attained such a high degree of what the psychologists would call structuration that if we didn't supply them with the material they would probably make it up themselves. As indeed they have; two Frenchmen, for example, have been making quite a good thing of turning out novels of stateside sadism and perversion as translations from the American. The myth has become self-perpetuating.

Here we see the folly of assuming mere information to be the cure for misinformation. The myth satisfies. In it the intellectuals find the rationalization for their own spiritual vacuum. For bewail as they may Europe's entrapment between "les deux colosses," they have been unable themselves to come up with a valid alternative. Why? They look away from themselves to chewing gum, bathtubs, and Coca-Cola for the answer.

Aesthetically, the impact of America's culture gives them a point—even the American must feel queasy when he sees a Grand Canal plastered with Coca-Cola signs. But this is not their main complaint. "What the French criticize," says *Le Monde*, after a swack at Coca-Cola, "is not so much Coca-Cola as its orchestration, less the drink itself than the civilization of which it is a mark and the symbol." *Le Monde* goes on to bemoan Buicks, Chryslers, nylon stockings, and chewing gum. "As soon as they appear these habits become an invasion. It is a question of the entire French moral landscape." Throughout Europe intellectuals throw up their hands in the same fashion; a culture based on such wealth, goes the theme, cannot help but be contaminating.

But is even this the nub—this question of whether material riches can be reconciled with spiritual force? No, Florence, Rome, and Athens answered this one in the affirma-

tive long ago. There is something else, more subtle, in the intellectual's animus, and it runs deep in current essays on United States culture. Why, the question keeps obtruding, is it so contagious? As he writes his farewells to happier days—the days when taste was still "undemocratized" and peasant girls were plump and didn't shave their legs—he writes his answer. It is a popular culture.

For here lies the true contagion of American culture. Whatever its aesthetics, it is above all else a proclamation to the world of the cultural enfranchisement of the common man. It is his culture, his own version of the pursuit of happiness—and a raucous ultimatum to a society that never allowed him to trespass quite so far. But to a Europe that is still culturally an aristocracy, the symbols of his enfranchisement are often vulgar and shoddy. Is it the vulgarity of these symbols or their implicit revolutionary promise that makes them so profoundly disturbing? It is the Europeans, let us remember, not ourselves, who are obsessed by the bathtub.

Why is American culture barbarious? Europeans have an easy answer: it is the product of a business civilization. Thus we come to the second great element in the mythology. For the European does not see the rapidly changing, socially conscious capitalism of 1950: he sees Wall Street, Mammon—and he trembles aloud over all the false dilemmas it would imply for Europe.

Thus, it is written, America's technological triumphs pose for Europe nothing less than the issue of man versus machine. Again we are back to the old spiritual theme. True, Europe wants America's mass-production techniques—but it is haunted by the fear that in adopting them it is making a compact with the devil. To many, American technology means the dehumanization of man—Charlie Chaplin poised in the gears is still a vivid symbol—and a Europe still deep in the old craft tradition is only now beginning to grasp the compatibility of mass production with quality and humanity. Somehow we have failed badly to show that, far from being narcotized by the machine, we have been invigorated by it.

But this failure in turn stems from a greater one: Our failure to demonstrate the tremendous difference between our capitalism and the capitalism of Europe. In this respect it is startling to listen to an American businessman just returned from Europe; almost invariably he will so revile its low-wage, high mark-up, monopoly economics that he sounds much more the howling revolutionist than the European Socialists who so mistrust him. His philosophy, however, remains uncommunicated. Not only are European capitalists utterly unconvinced of its value, the European masses are ignorant of its existence.

This double failure has had a deep effect on our relations with Europe. Translated by unregenerate European capitalism, ECA productivity has too often meant few benefits for the worker, but such profits for management that in Italy alone it has been hazarded that per capita there are more \$1,000,000-a-year men—paying less taxes—than there are in the United States. To a dangerous degree, our efforts have appeared to the European worker simply a collusion between reactionary blackguards; he still can conceive of American capitalism only in terms of his own—and he is sick of it. It is high time the American businessman realized that it is not European socialism but European capitalism that is the chief block to free enterprise. "The problem of Europe," as one observer puts it, "comes down to who is to liquidate the capitalists of Europe: the Russians—or the Americans."

These several points are best illustrated by the actual utterances of non-Communist Europeans. Here is a list of horrors culled from newspapers, periodicals, books, and radio:



"It is not what separates the United States and the Soviet Union that should frighten us, but what they have in common. Those two technocracies that think themselves antagonists are dragging humanity in the same direction of dehumanization; man is treated as a means and no longer as an end—this is the indispensable condition of the two cultures that face each other." (Francis Mauriac, Catholic and anti-Communist, in *Le Figaro*.)

"Americans appear the true successors of the Germans, America differs from Europe and resembles Russia, adorer of the technical." (Andre Siegfried, Protestant anti-Communist, in *Le Figaro*.)

"In all the homilies to which I listened, the word 'God' did not reverberate more often than the word 'money.' It is perhaps because too often they have emptied European religions of their intellectual content that they have no choice except between music and convulsions." (Georges Fradier; *Esprit*.)

"Of even the beginnings of the minutest embryo of a homogeneous culture there was no sign. A general preoccupation with trivia—I mean coke machines, launderettes, laxatives, and baseball—I construed as the American attempt to exclude the bigger reality." (Robert Robinson; the *Isis* (Oxford University).)

"Why they should not be originally creative is puzzling. It is possible that the lack of the organic sense, the conviction that man is a machine, turns them into technicians and cuts them off from the chaos, the accidents and institutions of the creative process." V. S. Pritchett; *The New Statesman and Nation*.)

"They come here, these barbarians, to teach us architecture—we, who are the sons of Michelangelo." (Italian Educator.)

"The Russians used to rape 80-year-old women. And after that, instead of being sick they simply drank vodka. You [Americans] wouldn't do that, I'm sure. You give them chocolates and contraceptives when you make love to them. Every people has its own customs. But don't worry. You'll never feel sick, whatever you do." (From Virgil Gheorghiu's *The Twenty-fifth Hour*, Europe's No. 1 fiction best seller.)

"American influence has been harmful, for it has already begun the scaling down of aesthetic values so as to be within the intellectual grasp of the average city dweller \* \* \* [it] will end, not with the debasement of taste, but with the disappearance of the word from our vocabulary." (Martin Cooper, BBC broadcast.)

"Thus, if France allows itself to be influenced by the whole of American culture, a living and livable situation there will come here and completely shatter our cultural traditions." (Jean-Paul Sartre, a European declaration of independence.)

"Jazz is their music, comic strips their most admired pictures, magazine stories their literature, Hollywood films their most popular entertainment, skyscrapers their architecture, and their newest ball-point pen can write under water. We know, too, that God could make America a wonderful country if he only had the money." (George Mikes in *How To Scrape Skies*.)

"America—the only country that's gone from barbarism to decadence without being civilized in the meantime." (Anonymous.)

Well, there they are—all the horrors, mythological or real, synchronizing in the one theme of spiritual impoverishment. Only recently have we begun doing something about it. After leaving the field to the Russians at first, we authorized the State Department in 1948 to set up an information and educational exchange program, and within a year this was further supplemented when ECA's information pro-

gram was organized. We remained pikers, however, and it wasn't until after Korea that Congress decided that a campaign of truth was in order and voted the money to get it going.

Will we get our money's worth? In view of the recent rise in American unpopularity, it is easy to assume that our propaganda dollars are going down the drain. But the feeling of futility is unwarranted—certainly if ECA had been a complete propaganda failure there would be no neutralism problem in Europe to worry about. We're fairly new to the game, but, as even the avuncular British concede, we have been learning fast. We are ready to turn "pro."

What have we learned? First, that we need much more of a sharpshooting approach to our target groups. There is no "European mind" but scores of group attitudes compounded along all sorts of professional, economic, and geographic lines. And the best way to get at them is through people that talk the separate lingo. We have had a hard time talking to European intellectuals, for example, yet so far we have used few intellectuals for the job. The work of our labor diplomats, in the toughest sector of the fight underlines the same moral. How do they go about it? "You talk to the brothers," says one of them. "You go around and you talk to the brothers."

Next, we have learned that one of the principal reasons for the disbelief in American culture is, simply, the high cost of it. Stroll along the Kaertnerstrasse in Vienna, for example, and you will have a hard time finding a bookstore with any decent assortment of moderately priced American books in German—that is, until you come to the Communist Information center, which has quite an interesting selection. Because of the lack of financial guarantees, European publishers have been loath to publish translations of anything except our sure-fire sex-and-mayhem fiction. So with the theater; stiff royalties—payable in dollars—have inhibited widespread production of United States plays, and while the American companies that have gone over have dispelled a lot of European delusions, they have been far too few to make a profound impression. Patently, if we wish to project American culture rather than talk about it, a much more vigorous subsidy program is in order.

More important, we must develop far better means of reaching the masses. Considerable ingenuity has been brought to this problem; our people have put documentary films into thousands of commercial theaters, taken them in trailers to rural villages, brought showboats to Mediterranean coastal towns, subsidized troubadours to sing our story in Sicily, floated message-bearing toy balloons all over Europe, distributed household pamphlets and comic books by the millions. But though it is difficult to think of a bet that has been overlooked, we have made only a dent.

Why don't we merely expand all this? The answer, unfortunately, is not that simple. Europe has had a bellyful of propaganda these last 10 years, and after a certain point—and it is a very arguable point—you run not only into diminishing returns but rapidly increasing resistance.

There is, however, a way out of the dilemma—the participation of foreign nations in the job. "Let me get the facts about Korea to one pro-United States union man over here," says a United States propagandist, "and he'll be worth a thousand posters." There are many ways to invoke this aid. But there is one so effective, so destructive of the myth, that it has come to be the most promising weapon in our whole armory.

It was in Paris in the summer of 1948; Sir Stafford Cripps and ECA Boss Paul Hoffman were talking about productivity. How,

Cripps asked, did the Americans do it? It was a question to delight a salesman's heart. "Let's bring your people over," Hoffman answered, "and we'll show them how."

So, with great vigor, we proceeded to do. Before long United States firms, labor unions, and professional groups were playing host to scores of European productivity teams. By the end of last year over 2,750 had made the trip and returned home—somewhat numbed but enthusiastic—to tell what they had learned. The result, in increased productivity, is now a well-known story, and a good story it is. But there is another story that is not so well known.

What was conceived of as a technical measure turned out to be one of the most effective propaganda tools ever handed us. What was it the Yanks had over there? Was it, as people had said, the number of gadgets and gimmicks we had? Fortuitous national resources? Ruthlessness and overwork? Or was it something more profound? We gave Europeans a chance to come over and discover for themselves. And gained ourselves disciples.

Here—in excerpts from productivity-team reports—are some of the things they had to say to their countrymen:

"A visit to the United States gives one greater confidence in the ability of democracy to solve its problems. The country is still moving forward both culturally, socially, and economically." (Norwegian trade-unionists.)

"American unions' attitude to company profits is typical of their acceptance of a capitalist economy. However high, profits, at least in competitive industry, are not regarded as immoral or a social evil; indeed they give proof of solvency and assured employment. The main concern of unions is to obtain a fair share of them." (British trade-union officials.)

"Contrary to the impression gained from many American films, only a small percentage of American workers and their families live in tenements." (British trade-union officials.)

"There appeared to be a most friendly and genuine attitude of cooperation between management and labor and suggestions made by one side appeared to receive careful consideration, and in most cases support, from the other." (British rayon-weaving team.)

"The relations between management and labor in the great majority of mills which we visited were excellent. There was often a sense of camaraderie based on mutual respect." (British cotton-spinning team.)

"Sometimes we had to ask ourselves whether it was manufacturer or union member speaking to us." (Danish ready-made-clothing team.)

"The big surprise to me was the importance American bosses give to human-relations problems. The American employer seems to be a psychologist aware that his prosperity is tied directly with that of the workers." (French unionist.)

"Both management and labor have taken steps to give greater efficiency in production and more understanding in relationships. When we return to Belgium I intend to recommend better management-labor relationships be created in our mines. I will see that this is done at Charbonnages de Houhalen, the mine I am managing." (Belgian coal-mining team.)

"If members of the team had learned nothing else from their travels in America and Britain, they would have learned one valuable thing; namely, the remarkable amount of good will which exists between people in the Western Hemisphere." (British gray-iron-founding team.)

It is difficult for an American to appreciate what revolutionary documents these are. The British trade-union officials' re-



port, for example, became a front-page story and gave British labor a resounding intellectual jolt. The Norwegian report, coupled with the report of a similar team that went to Russia, opened the eyes of left-wingers in a way that all the money in the world would not buy us. Throughout Europe, on a small but appreciable scale, doctrinaires of one kind or another are being provoked to rethink long and dearly held conceptions.

What gives the reports their impact? In an indirect way, the answer is to be found in the very criticisms they make. The teams make it plain that there are a good many aspects of the American way of life that they believe are either undesirable—the pace, for example—or inapplicable. But this leads them to a more important observation. These are only particulars, they say to their countrymen; they are not organic; the essentials of the American success can be had without them. And that is exactly the theme of the present book.

The technical-assistance teams are only one of the ways we have to go about the job of clarification. Thanks to the machinery set up in 1946 and 1948 by the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt acts, and to special programs for Germany, Austria, Finland, China, and Iran, State is bringing over students, teachers, professional people, specialists, and leaders. The Defense Department is doing the same with Japan. Both State and ECA are placing foreign trainees in United States industry, farms, and government agencies. Altogether, the government is now bringing over about 13,000 people a year for observation, study, teaching, training, and indoctrination. Cost: about \$45,000,000.

But by far the biggest contribution of all has been made by private organizations. This year they will have arranged roughly 40,000 exchanges of their own, and in addition will have footed a large share of the local expenses of many of the people brought over by the State Department. The 4-H clubs have been exchanging young farmers; the Rotary clubs have been bringing over students; the Girl Scouts, "youth leaders"—the list encompasses almost every kind of organization in American community life.

Measured against the need, however, our over-all exchange effort has been piddling.<sup>1</sup> There is a sort of geometric progression inherent to this kind of exchange, since the clue to its success is applying the proposition, it follows that the more people engaged in it, the more effective each individual's work becomes. It has been very frustrating for many middle-management people, for example, to return to Europe all steamed up about, say, labor-management councils, only to realize that no one else in the outfit has got the word. Like plasma, exchange is best in massive doses.

We have a tremendous opportunity before us. We should seize it by expanding our total propaganda budget to at least \$500,000,000 a year—and of this devote at least \$180,000,000 to exchange. We could not legislate a bigger bargain for ourselves. For every Government dollar we put in the exchange kitty, we stimulate at least two matching dollars from private groups here and organizations and governments on the other side. As a result, by priming the pump with \$180,000,000, we could step up the exchange to roughly 50,000 people a year to the United States; at least 10,000 in the other direction.

Mere expansion, of course, is not enough. Much more follow-up is needed abroad, equally important, much more preparation on this side. Exposure to America, as we have learned, does not itself produce understanding. The Mayor of Graz is a case in point; when he got back he wrote the State Department that the Communist claim

of imminent American bankruptcy might be correct—he had noticed that almost everyone in America seemed to be buying on the installment plan. To do the job properly we should greatly extend our present system of "orientation centers," and develop more provisions for working the stranger into community life. Here again, we have a tremendous asset in our private organizations. Already they are doing a tremendous job in welcoming and shepherding strangers, taking them on historical tours and plant trips, shepherding them to P. T. A. and town meetings, and, in general, making them feel at home. And it is this, it might be added, that visitors talk about most often when they get home.

What has impressed the visitor points a moral for us as well. For when we assess our whole communication effort we find that, as in industry's communication effort, participation lies at the heart of our successes. It is not merely a question of manufacturing propaganda. Nor is it merely a Government matter. The problem encompasses all of us—for it is only as the diverse groups that make up our society get involved in the job that our words carry real dynamism. And the potential is tremendous. United States business, for example, has already contributed to our communication effort, but there is still more to be done. For the one area that remains virtually untouched is the one area for which United States business is the best-qualified group in all the world: getting the American idea across to European top management. It is hardly necessary to suggest the means; there could be seminars and international conventions—organizations such as the International Chamber of Commerce are ready-made for this—trips and private exchanges of all sorts; and, as the success of the sales troupe "Red" Motley took to England suggests, some good old-fashioned barnstorming as well.

The more fields one thinks of the more opportunities become evident. Labor, for example, is fairly bursting its seams to do more missionary work in Europe—and the more this is encouraged the quicker will we reach European labor. So with all of our groups. The success of our communication efforts will depend ultimately on private initiative. And this is the way it must be. The American revolution is a challenge, not to States, but to freemen, whose never-ending task is to seize their opportunities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there are one or two other points in regard to the exchange part of the program. During 1950 and 1951 eight countries have been added to the program. Programs have been instituted or initiated with Ireland, Iceland, and Spain, which would make 11 countries since 1950. That fact should be kept in mind in comparing the figures requested by the Department for the 1952 program.

The object of the program is to build up relations with as many of the free nations as possible. We would have liked to have exchanges with some of the countries which are now behind the iron curtain. It may be that if we had gotten started in time they might not have gone behind the iron curtain. We had programs with Poland and Hungary, but their Red masters turned us down and would not permit them to continue.

Last year the Department offered to have an exchange with Yugoslavia. The House turned it down, which, I think, was a mistake. I believe it would be good international politics to let some of those people see this country. The best, most persuasive, most convincing evidence is for people to view our purposes

and our ability to do what we in this country believe in. We should let them come and see for themselves.

I particularly wanted to remind the Senate that because we had proposed an increase of \$10,600,000 for the exchange program this year, it was not simply a more expensive program for the same number but 11 new nations have come into it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hope the Senate of the United States will not seriously consider voting \$115,000,000 for this program. The pending amendment calls for \$115,000,000. This subject is one which was given extensive study by the Appropriations Committees of both the House and Senate. The House committee recommended \$85,000,000. The full Senate committee recommended \$63,000,000. The item stands at \$63,000,000 today in the bill before the Senate.

As regards the point raised by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I wish to say that in 1950 the exchange of students cost \$2,562,529. The Senate Appropriations Committee has allowed for that purpose \$5,000,000, or double the amount allowed in 1950. If in 1950 the exchange of students cost \$2,562,529, the same number can be exchanged this year at a cost of \$5,000,000. So nothing will be lost, so far as I can see, by holding to the amount allowed by the committee. The program for the exchange of students has not been impaired in the least.

Mr. President, I submit the matter to the Senate. I cannot believe that the Senate of the United States would increase the amount allowed for this item on the showing that has been made, from \$63,000,000 to \$115,000,000. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BENTON. I should like to use the 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BENTON. I wholly agree with the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that the effectiveness of the program should be studied and looked into. That is exactly what the Foreign Relations Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of my distinguished colleague, proposes to do. But I desire to point out that there is always great controversy over editorial work. There is not a copy of Time magazine, a magazine with a highly paid staff, which does not contain matter to which some Member of the Senate would object, or which he would like to have handled in a different manner.

I have spent a large part of my life in studying the subject of broadcasts. The broadcasts in question have improved in quality. The daily output of the Voice of America requires the preparation of approximately 350,000 words

<sup>1</sup> Koreans brought to Moscow between 1946 and 1949: 2,600. Brought to United States in same period: 65.



daily in order to conduct 49 program hours which are broadcast in 45 languages. More than 120 separate programs are presented each day by the Voice of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an interesting letter from Thurman L. Barnard, Acting General Manager, International Information and Educational Exchange Programs, addressed to me under date of August 22, 1951, dealing with programs emanating from the State Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, in time of crisis we do not propose to fail to make appropriations for the United States Army because of criticisms of the Army. The argument of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] applied to the Army would have kept us, because of criticisms which have been leveled against the Army, from stepping up our military preparedness effort. I submit it is not a sound approach in this hour of crisis.

Mr. President, rather than delay proceedings of the Senate further, and in view of my understanding with the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I will avoid the ye-and-nay vote by withdrawing my amendment in order to give support to the amendment which he proposes to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] withdraws his amendment.

#### EXHIBIT 1

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, August 22, 1951.

The Honorable WILLIAM BENTON,  
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR BENTON: Thank you for your letter dated August 17, 1951, forwarding a pamphlet containing two broadcasts made by Henry J. Taylor in his program Your Land and Mine. You have called my attention to remarks Mr. Taylor made during a broadcast from Zurich on July 23, 1951, in which he refers to the Voice of America as "a belligerent voice."

In the past, the Voice of America has frequently been accused of being too mild in tone. Now, we have Mr. Taylor's criticism which takes a completely opposite view. Comments regarding our language and technique now come from both ends of the critical spectrum. The truth rests between the extremes of being overly mild or overly belligerent.

The thought has been expressed in many quarters that the battle for the minds of men could not be won solely by emphasizing the advantages of democracy as practiced in the United States. Consequently, in April 1950, the President enunciated a new doctrine to be pursued by the United States in the conduct of the international information and educational exchange programs. This marked the opening of the campaign of truth. Upon the adoption of this new doctrine, the Voice of America sharpened its tone in exposing Kremlin imperialism not only to the people behind the iron curtain, but to the rest of the world as well. We believe that only forceful words can keep hope alive in the minds of the oppressed, and that part of our job is to place the guilt of oppression on those who are responsible. It is untrue to say, however, that the Voice of

America is "talking directly to Stalin in language about as violent as Goebbels ever used."

The effectiveness, in the free world, of the present tone used in Voice of America broadcasts is borne out by surveys among our overseas audience and by the letters we receive from listeners which total more than 30,000 every month. Evidence of Voice of America effectiveness in the Soviet Union and the satellite countries is determined through interviews with defectors, refugees, and others who have escaped from behind the iron curtain, and this evidence is confirmed by continued Russian efforts to jam the broadcasts and by the savage attacks made on the Voice of America by Radio Moscow and the Russian press.

Radio Moscow accuses the Voice of America of being operated by arrant humbugs and inveterate liars. It says the Voice of America is representative of the blood drinkers of Wall Street and further accuses the United States Government of prolonging the war in Korea so that American industry can reap huge profits. If we are to answer such lies at all, they are to be answered in strong, forceful language, and we do not believe the tone of our broadcasts in any way justifies the contention that we are baiting Stalin.

There are enclosed some sample scripts of recent Voice of America broadcasts which I believe will be of interest to you in determining whether Mr. Taylor's charges are well grounded. These scripts are forceful in tone and they call a spade a spade. I trust that in reading them you will keep in mind that they represent only a small portion of Voice of America daily output which requires the preparation of approximately 350,000 words daily in order to conduct the 49 programs hours which are broadcast in 45 languages. More than 120 separate programs are presented each day by the Voice of America and these programs vary in length from 15 minutes to 1 hour each. Some of these programs quite naturally are more forceful than others when you consider that their content includes such varied subjects as discussions of political, economic, social, and labor affairs, as well as news broadcasts and music, and commentaries and features on many different topics. Only in rare cases are broadcasts addressed personally to Stalin and this is done only on the basis of using Stalin as the personification of Communist imperialism. The Voice of America is by no means constantly baiting Stalin, addressing broadcasts to him with great violence, taunting him, calling him a coward and bluffer and everything else.

We continue to draw a distinction between the Russian people and their rulers. This is a theme which has been used in our broadcasts since 1947, when we initiated the Voice of America programs to the Soviet Union. It has been further developed and reemphasized since that time and one of the most recent expressions thereof is found in our radio and press coverage of the McMahon-Ribicoff resolution regarding the abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, including the peoples of the Soviet Union. Surely broadcasts of this type cannot be considered belligerent.

Thank you for calling Mr. Taylor's broadcasts to my attention. I am glad to have this opportunity to comment on his remarks.

Sincerely yours,

THURMAN L. BARNARD,  
Acting General Manager, International Information and Educational Exchange Programs.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on what are we now engaged?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is now considering the committee amendment, and the committee amendment is subject to amendment. The Senator from South Dakota has been recognized on his amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. This is the item on which we had a unanimous-consent agreement that 1½ hours be devoted to it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The senior Senator from South Dakota has 22½ minutes, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] 45 minutes, and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] 22½ minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope that after a while the senior Senator from South Dakota also will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. No, Mr. President, I do not intend to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has offered an amendment which—

Mr. MUNDT. No, Mr. President, I have not offered the amendment as yet. I am speaking during a portion of the 22½ minutes allotted to me. I yield myself 6 minutes. I may say that as soon as we have completed our discussion under the hour and a half of debate allotted to the general theme of Voice of America, I shall at that time offer my amendment to increase the amount to \$85,000,000, on which I will be allotted 20 minutes and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] will be allotted 20 minutes before the vote.

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon. My understanding is that the Senator from South Dakota now has 22½ minutes for general discussion.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. And then he will have 20 minutes on his amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. That would be 42½ minutes under the control of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I have yielded myself 6 minutes of my 22½ minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator can do as he pleases, of course.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; thank you.

First of all, I want to say that it seems to me that we should get the amount of money which we are now discussing in the proper perspective. I propose soon to offer an amendment to increase by \$22,000,000 the amount of money allotted by the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the whole overseas information program of the United States. I may point out that most of the discussion engaged in by my very good friend the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who, I see, is still on the floor, was directed to the Voice of America radio operations.

The subcommittee, in its good judgment, has not in any way reduced the amount of money made available for the Voice of America radio operations, so all the Senator's argument is directed against a proposition on which the subcommittee itself has overruled him. We are not asking for any increase whatever in the radio fund. The \$22,000,000 additional proposed in my amendment



is to be used for other phases of the overseas information program. However, I do not want it to appear that the only kind of radio broadcast which comes from the Voice of America is similar to the two-paragraph excerpt which the Senator quoted from a speech delivered on Abraham Lincoln's Birthday.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will my good friend yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield briefly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not want to give that impression, as the Senator from South Dakota well knows.

Mr. MUNDT. I know that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to state, however, that it departs from the objectivity of the program.

Mr. MUNDT. If one reads into the speech the interpretation that someone is trying to associate Abraham Lincoln with Karl Marx, it does so depart, but, as an old fisherman, I know that in trout fishing one has to try different flies, and the smell of the fish rather than the smell of the fisherman determines the lure. After all, in these broadcasts we have to appeal to different people, to different groups and classes in Europe, and whether we like it or not—and the Senator and I do not like it—a great many people in Europe, in the Scandinavian countries and in Western Europe, are Socialists, even though they are against the Communists. The philosophical doctrine of Karl Marx has had considerable appeal to them. So I can see considerable merit in pointing out that Abraham Lincoln was, as we know, a son of the people. Abraham Lincoln was interested in the workingman. Abraham Lincoln did free a great segment of our population and removed from them the chains of slavery. There is certainly nothing in the radio script which the Senator read which would indicate at all that it was expected that Abraham Lincoln should be considered a Communist or a Socialist.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend overlooked or failed to hear the emphasis on "class" in those two paragraphs.

Mr. MUNDT. The emphasis on class, I will say to my good friend from Illinois, who seems to want me to yield further, but I cannot yield to him any more, was made to a group of Europeans which is class conscious, and it was made to gain their confidence in America. The purpose of the whole broadcast is to wage war for the minds of men; to win friends for freedom.

Let me point out one short statement in the script of the Voice of America:

Reliable informants in Rome, recently escaped from Rumania, report that the Soviet Union is systematically stripping the vast, rich Carpathian forest area.

That is certainly carrying the offensive against communism. That is attacking the Communist regime. At some place in our whole foreign policy, at some place in this struggle for the minds of men, the United States must go on the offensive. We can do it and we are doing

it under the Smith-Mundt Act for which this appropriation is being requested.

Nowhere else in the whole program, except in the overseas information program, for which I am about to plead for \$22,000,000 additional money, do we go on the offensive. The rest of the program is largely a holding operation, and a very expensive holding operation, which has cost us about \$100,000,000 up to date. When we have spent that much on holding, it seems to me that it is not very much of an expenditure to make \$85,000,000 a year available to carry the battle offensively to the opposition.

Let me quote from another Voice of America radio broadcast. Here is a broadcast about China:

In the intervening 12 months the Chinese Communist regime has steadily increased its pressure to the point of a full-scale religious persecution aimed at absolute domination of Christian churches.

There is an appeal to all the people of Europe and Asia in whose hearts there still beats a religious fervor, carrying the offensive against the Communists. That is the thing which my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], suggested that we do. That is the thing that is being done, not only in the Voice of America, but in the other phases of the overseas information program, with respect to which sharp reductions have been suggested by the subcommittee.

I quote from another transcript from the Voice of America:

Communist authorities in Red China have steadily intensified their campaign of oppression ever since the beginning of the Korean War. During the month of July, however, this persecution was again stepped up.

We present now a special report on Communist terror in many areas of Red China. \* \* \* a month-long survey of information received from behind the Chinese iron curtain \* \* \* which shows the latest steps in the Communist pattern of mass arrests, mass killings, and mass deportations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 6 minutes have expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Already?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Already.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not wish to deprive any of my colleagues of their time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has no control over the time.

Mr. MUNDT. I know that. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, several typical excerpts of the kind of broadcasts being made by the Voice of America.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ROME—COMMUNISTS STRIP CARPATHIAN FORESTS

Reliable informants in Rome who recently escaped from Rumania report that the Soviet Union is systematically stripping the vast, rich Carpathian forest area.

#### BUDAPEST—HUNGARY'S WOMEN FIND IT HEAVY GOING IN HEAVY INDUSTRY

The Communist campaign throughout the satellite states to recruit women—in view of their equality—for heavy work on railways is receiving steady set-backs in Hungary due to the number of accidents in which Soviet women railway workers are involved.

#### REPORT ON ATTACKS ON CHURCHES

In the intervening 12 months the Chinese Communist regime has steadily increased its pressure to the point of a full-scale religious persecution aimed at absolute domination of Christian churches.

Here are some of the steps which have been taken—

Mission properties belonging to Roman Catholic and Protestant groups have been seized.

At least 12 foreign Catholic bishops are under arrest. These include four archbishops.

The Papal Internuncio in China—Archbishop Antonius Riberi is among those under house arrest. Soldiers surrounded his residence as of late June. This was just a few days after Communists had closed the Catholic Central Bureau in Shanghai, key organization for the coordination of Catholic work in China.

A large number of foreign priests and nuns of various Catholic missionary orders have shared the fate of the bishops.

Communist authorities in Red China have steadily intensified their campaign of oppression ever since the beginning of the Korean War. During the month of July, however, this persecution was again stepped up.

We present now a special report on Communist terror in many areas of Red China—a month-long survey of information received from behind the Chinese iron curtain—which shows the latest steps in the Communist pattern of mass arrests, mass killings, and mass deportation.

#### LIFE BEHIND THE CURTAIN

The Communist soldiers in Korea have been known to shield themselves behind groups of innocent civilians as they advance into battle; that is the Communist way. And this month the Communists have again thrown legions of innocent children into the front line of their propaganda war. The sponsors of the Communist youth festival now under way in East Berlin say their meeting is dedicated to peace.

But what's going on behind the front lines? How truly devoted to peace are the Communist regimes of Central and Eastern Europe?

#### OATIS CASE AROUSES STORM OF PROTEST

No act of Communist injustice directed against an individual has aroused the American people to greater indignation than the railroading to a Czechoslovak prison of the American newspaper correspondent, William Oatis. The perverted judicial system of sovietized countries has, of course, produced many other victims equally innocent. But no other case has more aptly symbolized the Communists' hatred for truth, their contempt for the fundamental freedoms, than this persecution of a man whose only crime was that of factual reporting.

In the mock trial to which Mr. Oatis was subjected the formal charge laid against him was espionage. But even through the Soviet-controlled Czechoslovak Government had complete control of the police and the court—even though the Soviet puppets who staged the trial were past masters at manufacturing false evidence—they were unable to produce the slightest proof that Mr. Oatis has committed a single act inconsistent with his duty as a decent newspaperman.

And what is life today, 11 years later, in these three once-free Baltic Nations?

On June 14, at Vilno, 40 workers of a shoe factory were reported killed or injured in a clash with MVD troops. This latest police censorship action reportedly was instigated



because news of the Vilno disturbance leaked to the outside world.

Low wages, scarcity of consumer goods, high prices, difficult working conditions—these can be as much a challenge as an annoyance to a man or woman. Why, fundamentally, do these people leave home? A Polish schoolteacher who was lucky enough to get to Paris—and stay there—put it succinctly:

"We don't belong to ourselves anymore—not in Poland. An ancient Greek philosopher once defined justice as 'the having and doing of what is one's own.' Well, in Poland we may no longer have anything of our own, and we may no longer do anything of our own. We are allowed to have only what the Soviet Union casts off."

Like the Japanese Fascists, from whom, presumably, they learned how to use opium as a weapon of warfare, the Chinese Communists are now busily reintroducing in many areas of southeast Asia the illegal use of opium. For, like the Fascists before them, the Communists know that if they can encourage the widespread use of drugs among the people of Malaya, Thailand, Burma, and other countries of southeast Asia, then these people will soon become dependent on the Communists for further supplies.

We bring you today the truth concerning the deportation situation within the Hungarian city of Budapest—the city upon which the Soviets have concentrated their greatest deportation efforts to date—the city from which 30,000 persons have been evicted thus far.

First-hand accounts indicate that once-beautiful Budapest today is a city of unrest and even terror, especially at night. This is when the hated deportation orders are received.

Mr. MUNDT. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield about a minute to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield a minute to the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee I was present at the time this budget was discussed and committee action was taken on the entire item in the appropriation bill. It will be noted that there is no change in the appropriation for the Radio Broadcasting Division. That item in the appropriation bill is the same as it was in the House text.

At the time the question arose as to whether the sum appropriated for this particular item in the appropriation bill should be \$63,000,000 or \$85,000,000—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 1 minute has expired.

Mr. THYE. I ask the Senator from South Dakota to yield me an additional minute.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. At the time this question was before the committee, as to whether we should appropriate \$63,000,000 or \$85,000,000, I could not and did not support the motion to increase the amount from \$63,000,000 to \$85,000,000. However, immediately upon the adjournment of the committee I proceeded not only to contact the State Department, but to obtain information from others on the

over-all program, because I felt that if we could reach the minds of the people with an idea, that would be much cheaper than going to war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield one final minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. For that reason, Mr. President, I now rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], because after having contacted the State Department and sought further information, I am of the opinion that we might well increase the amount to \$85,000,000. I think it would be money well spent, and that we could achieve more through this method than with bullets.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is recognized for 22½ minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, did the Chair recognize the Senator from Arizona or the Senator from Virginia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] had 22½ minutes. The senior Senator from Arizona had the other 22½ minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Arizona is recognized for 22½ minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 7 minutes to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, for many years the outstanding leader for economy in the Congress of the United States has been the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRN]. During that period he has had no more faithful supporter in his economy efforts, first for 14 years in the House and for the past 4 years in the Senate, than the present junior Senator from Virginia, although, of course, as would be expected of two Senators who do their own thinking, there have been minor differences concerning what is essential and what is nonessential Federal spending.

Throughout the past 18 years the Virginia Senators have actively supported every necessary military program, including our present defense efforts. But in considering whether or not he should support the House item of \$85,000,000 for the Voice of America and information services of the State Department when a majority of his Appropriations Committee colleagues have felt that an economy of \$22,000,000 could with propriety be effected, the junior Senator from Virginia has been forced to the reluctant conclusion that the ultimate end of an international rearmament program will be war.

Yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee stated that no one who has not carefully analyzed the provisions of the pending tax bill can fully appraise its terrific impact upon our domestic economy, and then he added that there was every indication

that, regardless of whether or not the Senate accepted the full provisions of the House bill, we would, within another year, be confronted with the necessity of passing another tax bill to raise approximately as much additional revenue as we propose to raise this year.

Every thoughtful man is therefore bound to admit that we cannot indefinitely support a military establishment of that magnitude and that the time will inevitably come when we will in effect say to the Soviet Union, "We are tired of being pushed around and will not stand for it any longer." And that is when the shooting will start.

In my humble opinion the only alternative is to convince the rank and file of the masses behind the iron curtain that we definitely prefer peace to war, that we definitely prefer the laws of the Sermon on the Mount to the laws of the jungle. If that be true, our only medium of getting that message to the people we desire to reach is the Voice of America and the program of printed information connected with it.

We must concede that the Voice of America has fallen short of the constructive goal which the American people confidently had expected of it. Large sums of money have been spent, and we are asked to appropriate larger sums, that peace and friendship may be engendered throughout the world, and that the doctrine of freedom be carried to enslaved peoples smarting hopelessly under the yoke of tyranny.

Permit me to say that the reason this fine plan has been a disappointment is due to the fact that the Voice, which could well have become a powerful instrument in representing the true spirit of democracy and Christian morality in America, has been so distorted as to give forth not only an uncertain sound, but a spurious picture of what America stands for, as has been pointed out on the floor this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in quoting from one of the programs which sought to link up Abraham Lincoln with Karl Marx.

As stated by the Christian Science Monitor, in its issue of August 23:

Which is more important: the tons of steel poured into armaments or the ideas than can help to free the world from the threat of war? The question is hypothetical, for at this juncture of human affairs both ideas and armaments are necessary. But it suggests a query as to why legislators are willing to vote billions of dollars for weapons to destroy men's bodies while boggling at a few millions for truth-telling agencies to free men's minds.

We are not a nation given over to a strange blend of "isms," jazz, and cynical flippancies. We are a serious nation, built upon courage and integrity of character and purpose. We are, if you please, a nation literally and historically founded upon the glory and pleasure of Almighty God. The solid backbone of our American people adheres to only one doctrine: the doctrine of our early leaders, which was not blown about by every passing wind, but was unequivocal in the eyes of an overruling Sovereign. In the early days of our country there was but one standard, that is, is a



thing right, or is it wrong in His sight? Not, is it expedient, and will it meet with the approval of a Stalin or some other heathen dictator?

That is the basic America today. That is the reason our Nation has survived buffetings from without and dissensions from within. But that is not the picture of America which has been given over the radio to the nations of the world.

In my opinion this situation can be rectified, and if it is, the Voice of America can still become one of the most effectual mediums on this earth for good.

We might as well look realistically at the course of the pendulum which is swinging belatedly in the opposite direction from which it has been traveling for the past 30 years or more. Fear is finally driving us back to our early beginnings. We have come to the realization that there is a destiny shaping our ends, over which we have absolutely no control, and it behooves us—in the midst of our puzzling extremity—to see what we must do about it.

There is but one thing we can do about it, and that is to follow the example, which already is being set by certain fine columnists and commentators, and by a great army of American citizens from all walks of life, namely, get back to God as quickly as possible. Gen. Omar Bradley epitomized our situation when he said: "We know more about killing than living, and we have too many men of science in America today—too few men of God."

The world is looking to us, the most boastfully successful, rich, and powerful nation upon earth, for material help. We could, at the same time, accept the challenge of Christian leadership which our founding fathers bequeathed to us. This body, the Senate of the United States, is known as the most influential body in the world. It may seem to be outside of our province, but it is possible for us to assume a vitally constructive spiritual leadership against the aggressively anti-God ideology of communism. Such leadership is appallingly lacking in this hour of world crisis.

From the vantage point of this sounding board, and with the aid of our Commander in Chief, we can really do something about penetrating the terrible darkness behind the iron curtain. This may appear to be an impossible undertaking, but there is within man a strange attraction for the difficult, and we must bear in mind that the extremity of man is the opportunity of God.

I am proposing, first, that we earmark funds appropriated for the Voice of America to be used for the specific purpose of sending out over the air an exposition of the Christian principles upon which America was founded and upon which she has grown to her present position of eminence in the community of nations.

In the second place, I am proposing a strict censorship of this Voice, which purports to represent American life. The trial and error method has been applied, which is natural in testing any new agency. We must not say categorically that it is a total failure. We do main-

tain, however, that for the most part it is a misrepresentation of the whole picture, and it avoids with scrupulous care the very capstone of America's culture and stamina—the Bible.

If these programs are to be sent out over the air from stations of greater volume than those now in use, naturally I would like to see them placed under the direction of a man of the splendid ability and character of the Honorable Gordon Gray, and I would suggest to him that all nations be permitted to know that the true America is experiencing a mighty spiritual awakening and, under the banner of her God, she will carry out the Divine injunction: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel (of salvation) to every creature."

Already we have on the air from coast to coast splendid evangelistic services with their facilities ready for immediate use. We could channel these inspirational messages, which are combined with excellent music, to foreign lands.

I have in mind the Billy Graham Hour of Decision program; the Old-Fashioned Revival Hour, from Long Beach, Calif.; the Dr. Donald Gray Barnhouse programs from Philadelphia; Dr. DeHahn's Bible Study Hour, from Grand Rapids, Mich.; and outstanding Catholic leaders like Pope Pius in Rome, and Bishop Fulton J. Sheen in this country. All of these are sound and nationally known. Let inspired men of God, such as these, speak for us to the world, and not the exponents of a superficial way of life, which by no means bespeaks our high calling.

The conflict, which is being waged in the world today, is a religious war just as certainly as the so-called Holy Wars of the past, except that this one on a world-wide scale against the wildest and most sinister adversary of all time, may well be the beginning of the final showdown. The terrible urgency of the matter cannot be overemphasized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask for a half minute.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield another minute to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we must, therefore, choose our weapons accordingly and, putting on the whole armor of God, say with young David: "You come with sword and spear, but I come in the name of the Lord God of Hosts. If God be for us, who can then be against us?"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, my views regarding the compelling need for the Voice of America and other international informational services are already well known. I have spoken on the subject many times, and I shall therefore take only a very small part of the time that has been allotted to me.

I believe that it is absolutely essential to build up our own military strength and the strength of our allies. But military strength is by no means all that is needed. It will not alone do

the work. We must, step by step with military strength, build up confidence in this country and in the purposes and aims of our allies and ourselves.

Through military strength we may prevail for the time being, but I am certain that we cannot permanently prevail in this confused and disturbed world unless we convince the people, both behind the iron curtain and in the free countries this side of the iron curtain, of our good faith and our intense desire to preserve our liberties and the freedoms of other peoples. That can be done only if we have adequate means of communicating our thoughts to those people and getting over to them our ideals and our philosophy. We will fail unless we win the minds and the hearts of the people of the world.

We must absolutely bring home to people everywhere the principles on which this country was built, the ideals to which we adhere today. We must convince them of our desire to bring peace and security to all the world. Through the means of the Voice of America we can show them that we want no conquest and that we want no personal advantage.

Unless we do so, Mr. President, we will continue to be under suspicion, and our motives will be questioned. Under those circumstances we cannot possibly hope to maintain and retain the confidence and the loyalty of other free people.

I hope, with all my heart, that this appropriation will be increased and, accordingly, that the amendment will prevail.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have used half of my time. I suggest that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] use some of his time now.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Arizona had 45 minutes. I do not believe he has used half of his time.

Mr. HAYDEN. I had 22½ minutes. I have used more than half of that time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope he will use the rest of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I would prefer that the Senator from Nevada use some of his time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I would prefer it if the Senator from Arizona used some more of his time.

Mr. HAYDEN. After you, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 45 minutes remaining. The Senator from Arizona has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have used more than half of my time. It is only fair that the Senator from Nevada use some of his time.

Mr. McCARRAN. We want to get through with the amendment. I suggest that the Senator from Arizona use some more of his time.

Mr. HAYDEN. I decline to do so at this time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I inquire what the traditions or customs of this august body are with respect to the present situation? My training in Congress has been confined mostly to the other body. In the House when a division of time is in effect it is the custom to move from one side to the other.



Is it the custom in the Senate for one side to exhaust all of its time and then for the other side to exhaust its time, without any opportunity being given for refutation?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into. I do not believe any observations by the Chair can change the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MUNDT. I am not trying to change it. I am trying to find out whether there is a custom, tradition, or rule. If there is not, there seems to be need that it should be supplied in future agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An agreement on the division of time has been worked out. In this case it involves three Senators, who control the time.

Mr. MUNDT. I do not believe the fact that there are three Senators involved changes the fact that we have only two points of view. One point of view has exhausted half of its time. The other point of view has not used any of its time. I wondered whether there was any arrangement under which we could proceed from one view to the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If no Senator wishes to be recognized, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] does not care to present his side, I suggest that the Senate vote.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator from South Dakota were to call up his amendment, which he has not done, 20 minutes would be available to each side; would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it the understanding of the Chair that at the end of the 20 minutes of debate on my side there would still be available to my friend the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] his 20 minutes plus his 45 minutes on the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the time would still be available, if the Senator's amendment were rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. If my amendment had been debated for 20 minutes by Senators who support it, and if 20 minutes had been used by Senators who spoke in opposition to it, and it automatically came up to a vote, would 45 minutes still be available to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment has been debated, with 20 minutes pro and 20 minutes con, the committee amendment will then come to a vote.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not lose my time; that cannot be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been referring to the debate

on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment. The Senator from Nevada will not lose his time.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will not lose my time at any time; there was no curtailment in that respect and the matter is before the Senate now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada does not lose his time on the committee amendment; but 20 minutes will be allowed pro and 20 minutes will be allowed con for the purpose of debate on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Nor do I lose my time on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; when the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is offered to the committee amendment, the Senator from South Dakota will have 20 minutes to speak in favor of his amendment to the committee amendment, and the Senator from Nevada will have 20 minutes to speak in opposition to the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. And my allotment of time on the committee amendment—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment is debated and voted on, then before the committee amendment is finally disposed of, the Senator from Nevada can use up to 45 minutes on the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Presiding Officer is now injecting new matter into the unanimous-consent agreement, and I seriously object to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, there would be 1½ hours on the committee amendment and then 40 minutes on any other amendments.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is all right. I still have 40 minutes of my 45 minutes upon the committee amendment; and if the Senator from South Dakota offers an amendment to the committee amendment, I shall have 20 minutes when I see fit to use them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada will.

If the Senator from South Dakota offers his amendment to the committee amendment, the Senator from South Dakota will have 20 minutes and the Senator from Nevada will have 20 minutes on that amendment to the committee amendment.

When the amendment to the committee amendment is disposed of, the question will recur on agreeing to the committee amendment; and then the Senator from Nevada can use his 45 minutes as he sees fit.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Chair rule that I cannot address myself to the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at all; the Senator can use his 45 minutes now if he wishes to do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. Was there anything in the unanimous-consent agreement in regard to when I shall use my 45 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; except that so long as the committee amendment is pending, the Senator from Nevada can use his 45 minutes.

However, when the Senator from South Dakota offers his amendment to the committee amendment, the question then will be on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there never will be another unanimous-consent agreement if the Presiding Officer is going to interpret the agreement after it is made and is going to inject something new into it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the distinguished Senator from Nevada misunderstands the Chair's ruling.

As I understand the ruling, it is that the distinguished Senator from Nevada has 45 minutes which he can use at any time he pleases. He can use it after the disposal of the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment—

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, or before that.

Mr. McFARLAND. But when the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is offered to the committee amendment, then the committee amendment is no longer the pending question.

Mr. McCARRAN. The committee amendment is always the pending question. The committee amendment has to be voted on by the Senate after the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment is disposed of. What is the use of saying anything else? The committee amendment is always before the Senate until it is either adopted or rejected.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, an amendment to the committee amendment must be disposed of first.

Mr. President, I do not think it makes any difference. Personally, I should like to see the Senator from Nevada use his time in any way he wishes. However, he cannot use time on the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment until the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment is offered.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understand that, but I thought the Senator from South Dakota had already offered his amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; he has not yet done so.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. Then, let us understand this matter, because if the present Presiding Officer is going to continue to preside and if he is going to rule that I cannot have my time after the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is offered to the committee amendment, I want to know that right now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona who propounded



his inquiry, made clear, in the opinion of the Chair, what was in his mind; and that sustains the understanding of the Chair as to the unanimous-consent agreement.

The Senator from Nevada has 45 minutes on the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But if the Senator from Nevada does not see fit to use his 45 minutes, and if the Senator from South Dakota offers his amendment to the committee amendment, the pending question then is on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment; and at that time 40 minutes is available on that amendment to the committee amendment, with 20 minutes to be used by the Senator from South Dakota and 20 minutes by the Senator from Nevada.

When that amendment to the committee amendment is disposed of, the question will recur on agreeing to the committee amendment; and then the Senator from Nevada can use his 45 minutes if he sees fit to do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I object to the injection into the unanimous-consent agreement of a provision which was not included in the agreement. The Presiding Officer cannot find it in the agreement. I challenge any Senator to find that interpretation in the agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, to whose time will this time be charged? In whose time are we now proceeding? Will the Chair state?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time used for this purpose is not being charged to either side.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, personally I do not want that there be any misunderstanding.

I now ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Nevada may use his remaining time, if any, when and if the Senator from South Dakota submits his amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, that would entirely nullify the full significance of the unanimous-consent agreement. It was that there would be 20 minutes to each side on any additional amendment.

If I were to agree to the present request, it would mean that 20 minutes would be available to those who favor the amendment to the committee amendment, and 20 minutes plus 45 minutes would be available to those who oppose the amendment to the committee amendment. Obviously no Senator would agree to such a proposal.

The whole purpose is to keep the matter equally balanced. Any arrangement which can be made to that end, I favor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to extend the unanimous-consent request I have just made, so as to provide that the proponents of the amendment to the committee amendment be allowed the same amount of time that is available to the other side; and the proponents of the amendment to the committee amendment may use it either in

opposition to the committee amendment or in favor of their amendment to the committee amendment, as they may choose to do.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall be happy to agree to any arrangement which will divide the time equally.

Mr. McFARLAND. That arrangement would be fair to both sides.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we entered into a unanimous-consent agreement, and it still prevails, so far as I know.

If the Senator wishes to withdraw the agreement, I will consent to that; I do not care.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I do not wish to withdraw the agreement. However, if we are to allow the distinguished Senator from Nevada to use his 45 minutes to speak on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment, the other side should have the same privilege. The road should be a two-way road. I do not see how the Senator could disagree to such an arrangement.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the time—which has been used up to the present time has been on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. No, since the Senator from South Dakota has not yet offered his amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. However, his amendment to the committee amendment has been the subject matter of the debate all along.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from South Dakota has stated that he has not yet offered his amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Perhaps he has not yet offered it to the committee amendment, but he has been speaking on it just the same; in other words, he comes in the back door, instead of in the front door.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, it is impossible to prevent a Senator from speaking on any subject which he wishes to discuss.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand that we are not speaking on any allocation of time now. Therefore, I shall talk on this matter the rest of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That could not be done. The recent proceedings have been in the form of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCARRAN. I understood the Presiding Officer to say that the time being used at this time was not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair said it was not being taken out of the time of the Senator from Nevada or out of the time of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall address myself strictly and germanely to the subject matter, and I am not going to yield to have the unanimous-consent agreement changed now, in the middle of the afternoon.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The last idea I had in the world, when I made the suggestion, was to deprive the Senator from Nevada of all the time which had been allotted to him under the unanimous-consent agreement. My only suggestion was that, having 45 minutes, he use some of it at this time; and he indicated he did not want to do that. If he did not want to use his time, then perhaps I do not want to use mine, and we might just as well vote and be done with it; but apparently that does not meet with the Senator's wish.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator from Arizona or the Senator from South Dakota had been addressing himself to the committee amendment, I would have gone forward.

Mr. HAYDEN. The only time I yielded was in connection with the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the Senator was addressing himself to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, and the Senator from South Dakota was addressing himself to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, pardon me. If the Senator will permit, the committee amendment is before the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. If it is not adopted, is it not a fact that the appropriation will be in the sum of \$85,000,000?

Mr. McCARRAN. Sixty-three million dollars is the amount provided in the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. But if the committee amendment is rejected, the amount will be \$85,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, that is correct. That is the House figure.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly what the Senator to whom I yielded stated. It is exactly what the Senator from New York stated. They were opposed to the committee amendment. They made no reference to any amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota, now or prospectively.

If we can get going again, the Senator from Arkansas has indicated he would like to have 5 minutes of my time, and I yield it to him.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is 5 minutes out of my time, in which the Senator will be speaking.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thought I had 11 minutes left, but I only had 5.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is all the time there is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks in support of the international exchange program of the State Department, funds for which are carried in this bill.

These programs provide for the exchange of persons between the United States, and other countries, for purposes of study, teaching, lecturing, research. In addition, we bring influential leaders—such as newspapermen, labor leaders, and others in a position to influence



public opinion in their native countries—into this country to observe our way of life, our purposes and resources, firsthand.

The legislative authority for the exchange of persons activities of the State Department is contained in two acts: the Fulbright Act and the Smith-Mundt Act.

Five years ago this month, on August 1, 1946, Congress enacted Public Law 584, Seventy-ninth Congress, frequently referred to as the Fulbright Act. In form, this was an amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944. It authorizes the Secretary of State to use credits in foreign currencies, which are not convertible into dollars, to finance Americans studying abroad and to help bring foreign students to the United States. These credits arose out of the sale of surplus war materials left in foreign countries at the conclusion of World War II. These materials consisted of everything from bulldozers and locomotives to chewing gum and aspirin, and were scattered all over Europe, Asia, and the Middle East.

Under this act, executive agreements, providing for the utilization of these foreign currency credits, have been negotiated with 21 countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium, and Luxemburg, Burma, China, Egypt, France, Greece, India, Iran, Italy, Korea, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and Iraq.

Under the program, foreign currencies can be spent for the education of Americans in foreign institutions, and for the education of citizens of other countries in American institutions located in foreign countries.

Up to June 30 of this year, the equivalent of approximately \$11,500,000 in foreign currencies, has been paid by foreign countries for benefits to 7,393 grantees. Three thousand one hundred and eighty-one Americans from 48 States have gone abroad to study, teach, lecture, or conduct research, while 3,234 students of other countries have received awards for study here. The balance consisted of foreign students sent to American institutions abroad. Selections are nearing completion now for about 3,000 persons who will receive awards under this year's program. The grants are eagerly sought now that the program has become better known. Student applications are particularly impressive. For France alone, there were 225 openings for 1950-51 and 2,700 students applied for them. Approximately 600 students went overseas last fall as exchange scholars, under this program. There were some 7,000 applications for these 600 spots.

Foreign currencies can also be allotted for transportation of citizens of other countries coming to the United States to study in our institutions. While transportation is a substantial portion of their total cost, dollars are needed to fully utilize the foreign currency transportation money which is available.

Some of this is provided by private individuals, organizations, such as Rotary, foundations, colleges, and univer-

sities. It still remains necessary, however, if we are to maintain a real two-way exchange, for the Congress to appropriate dollars.

These appropriations, in addition to those for the Voice of America and our other international information and educational programs, are authorized by the Smith-Mundt Act. Furthermore, this act provides authority for exchanges with countries other than the 21 which I have mentioned as included in the program of the Fulbright Act.

While I am convinced of the value of a two-way exchange of persons, I am firmly of the opinion that of the two, the most effective is for persons coming into this country. It is only by living in this country that people can understand it.

This is the way a young foreign journalism student—a girl—put it after returning from her studies here:

Seeing the much-vaunted American way of life would convince even the staunchest Communist that there must be something to individual liberty and free enterprise after all. He might have his grandiose schemes and visionary theories, but he still needs an iron curtain. The American has no need for a blueprint of democracy; he lives it, he benefits from it, he guards it, and he has justifiable pride in opening the doors of his country—the tangible proof, the best argument for the intangible spirit of democracy.

My appeal, then, is primarily for support of the Smith-Mundt Act, rather than for the act which I sponsored.

Mr. President, the exchange-of-persons program, and our other activities in the field of international information and education, are not business-as-usual activities, which we can afford to cut back. I am in favor of cutting back the normal, peacetime functions of government, in order that we may devote more funds to the really crucial question of peace or war.

The question of peace or war is the dominant one for today, and as far ahead as we can see. No authority on the subject that I know of can foresee a definite and positive settlement of the issue. Apparently the most we can hope for at the present is a delicate balance between the forces of the free and those of Communist Russia, in which there will neither be total war nor total peace. This is the condition under which we must work and live, and it will involve a substantial effort to which we are wholly unaccustomed, and to which our system of government and our way of life are, perhaps, ill-suited by nature.

Now it seems to me, if these assumptions are correct, that we should devote more and more of our thought and energy, our resources and our treasure, to a solution of the basic problems involved in international relations. The basic problems arise out of suspicion, fear, and ignorance, mistrust and misunderstanding; prejudice and hate. All of these involve attitudes of the mind—not territories or organizations or weapons or economic advantages and disadvantages.

If we are right in the struggle in which we are engaged, our rightness is not to

be demonstrated in terms of the lands which we are able to dominate, nor the organizations or treaties which we are able to create, nor the demonstration of our armed might, nor our ability to trade and bargain. All these things have their place, it is true, in the immediate struggle for temporary advantage—in the balancing of our power against that of our enemies. But they do not reach the basic causes of conflict—which lie in the minds of men. All of them, while capable of securing transitory advantage, also carry with them the seeds of conflict, because they arouse envy and resentment, fear and suspicion—unless they are accompanied by knowledge and understanding of our motives.

In the campaign for the minds of men, we have tremendous advantages over the Soviet. In the first place, I believe that the truth is on our side and, in the second place, because we do not operate behind an iron curtain, we are in a position to demonstrate the truth, visibly and personally. This gives us an opportunity which we should exploit to the maximum.

Surely it is not necessary to argue the fact that the best possible persuasive device—the best method of winning friends and influencing people—is person-to-person contact. Legislators, all politicians and elected officials, know this to be the most effective method of campaigning. Every school teacher and preacher and missionary knows it. Every public relations expert knows it. Everyone who has anything at all to do with human relations knows that, although one may learn something of other people vicariously, through books or radio, the best way to know a people is to live and work among them, to speak their language as they speak it.

Mr. President, because of the time element, I ask that the remainder of my statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. FULBRIGHT's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is follows:

The program for the exchange of persons with other countries is not designed for the promotion of education or scholarship, as such, although that, in itself, is a worthy byproduct of the program. One of our greatest needs in the field of foreign relations, and in international military affairs, is a substantial corps of people with experience in foreign countries, which, when it becomes necessary, they can devote to the defense and security of the Nation. This experience may consist only of familiarity with foreign languages, and yet be extremely useful. It may also consist of knowledge of geography, political life and institutions, economic conditions, history, and the many other characteristics of a foreign country and its people. Young people, with intimate knowledge of these matters, acquired firsthand, can make significant contributions to our national security. It seems to me that we have been deficient in this respect throughout our history, not because of any inability on the part of our people to learn foreign languages, and to become experts on foreign nations; but simply because during our long period of relative isolation there was little compulsion on us to acquire these skills and knowledge. However, we are now, whether we like it or not, the leading na-



tion of the world, and we have assumed a very great part of the responsibilities which go with that leadership. We should overlook no possibilities of acquiring for our people the knowledge which will enable us to discharge the responsibilities which we have assumed.

However, as I have indicated, the promotion of scholarships and the attainment of specialized skills, are not the primary purposes of the program for the exchange of persons. The purpose of the program is the achievement of international understanding, from which peaceful and cooperative relations between nations may grow.

A few months ago Rene Pleven, Prime Minister of France, visited Washington and talked with the President, with Senators and with Representatives. There was a wave of neutralism in Europe, especially France, and a feeling of discouragement with our friends was growing in Washington.

Prime ministers of foreign countries have often visited Washington, but this visit was different. The difference was that this Prime Minister had lived and worked in the United States. He spoke the language perfectly and above all he understood America. He had lived in Chicago and his work had taken him throughout the Middle West where he became intimately acquainted with typical American businessmen and citizens of all types. His simple, straightforward talks to our leaders in Washington, without interpretation and with complete understanding, revived their faith in the French and their confidence in the North Atlantic Pact.

Only a few weeks ago the President of Ecuador visited our country. As a young man, he attended college in this country and worked and traveled about widely. Here again the formalities were at a minimum and the understanding at a maximum, as everyone who saw and spoke to him felt reassured that such a man as Galo Plaza is President of our good friend Ecuador.

A very valuable precedent to the present program is the experience of the Belgian-American Foundation, organized immediately after the First World War. Funds remaining from relief commission work done by Americans in Belgium were devoted to the education of Belgians in American institutions. The program was created largely through the efforts of Herbert Hoover. As a result of the program, at the outbreak of World War II, nearly one-quarter of the teaching and research faculties of Belgian universities had been graduate students in American colleges. One Prime Minister and six cabinet members had likewise done graduate work in American universities. It is doubtful whether there is any country in Europe where the ideals and purposes of America are so well understood and appreciated as they are in Belgium; and there is much greater understanding and respect for Belgium in the United States, as a result of this program and the foresight of Mr. Hoover in creating it.

These are merely a few examples of what I believe an expanded exchange of persons program can accomplish on a wide basis. By the interchange of people between nations we can bring about an understanding of America, by the people of other countries, which will create a solid basis for friendship and cooperation.

It has been said that programs for the exchange of persons, and of students, particularly, can accomplish only long-range results. It is true, of course, that the full impact is spread over a long period. Obviously, education, as such, is a program to be measured in years, but I believe that we received very substantial benefits in the good will of other nations from the beginning of the program. I believe that this continuing evidence of our interest in relations with them on a basis other than military or economic, does much

to enhance our standing in the eyes of the civilized peoples of the world. For years our enemies have preached that we were economic imperialists, with no genuine interest in the welfare of others, and with no understanding of anything but gadgets and business. This undertaking on our part gives the lie to such propaganda.

Certainly there can be no question that the exchange of leaders—in business and labor, in scientists and teachers, journalists—can have an immediate as well as a long-term effect. For example, a journalist on a foreign newspaper, gathered enough material during his visit here to write more than thirty articles about the United States for his own newspaper. (Sir Patrick Dollan, managing editor, Glasgow Herald, Glasgow, Scotland.)

Fortune magazine, in its issue of February 1951, quotes from a report made by a British trade-unionist after a visit to this country, as follows:

"American unions' attitude to company profits is typical of their acceptance of a capitalist economy. However high, profits, at least in competitive industry, are not regarded as immoral or a social evil; indeed they give proof of solvency and assured employment. The main concern of unions is to obtain a fair share of them.

"Contrary to the impression gained from many American films, only a small percentage of American workers and their families live in tenements."

Fortune says that this report "became a front-page story and gave British labor a resounding jolt."

A similar report made by Norwegian trade-unionists said:

"A visit to the United States gives one greater confidence in the ability of democracy to solve its problems. The country is still moving forward both culturally, socially, and economically."

Fortune said that this report, "coupled with the report of a similar team that went to Russia, opened the eyes of left-wingers in a way that all the money in the world would not buy us."

One American professor, Dr. Perry Miller, who went to the Netherlands under a private exchange agreement, and later was given a grant to enable him to visit other countries, estimated that he had lectured to over 30,000 persons outside his classroom during the course of a year.

An important government official from a North Atlantic Treaty nation, in his own words proves the effectiveness of this type of exchange. He said:

"Also, I was shown convincingly how earnest the American people are in their efforts to strengthen defense, not only in their own country, but in other parts of the free world—not the least in Western Europe. The 'peace through strength' motto is prevalent in the United States. Finally, I found no trace of aggressiveness. They [the American people] want to be left alone and live in peace—but not a peace at all costs. There is no doubt about this."

One specialist whom we brought to this country from a land bordering on the iron curtain wrote after his return complaining that before coming to the United States he had been afraid of Russian communism but had changed his mind after seeing the strength and purpose of America. He wrote: "If you invite people from other countries to visit the United States, you can make your passive friend your active ally."

Another defender of our cause is a Latin-American radio commentator who came to this country several weeks ago under the auspices of the Department of State and who, during the last year or so, has made some of the strongest public attacks in his country against the Stockholm "peace petition."

A prominent European editor, in the course of a visit to the United States, became so impressed with the dangers of neutralism

as a weapon of the Communists in Europe that he resigned from his paper on his return and has brought his views to the attention of many high governmental officials with good results.

An American studying at the University of Florence wrote:

"Visiting Calabria obliged me to play the role of school teacher, American news information spokesman, and favorite cousin all in one \* \* \* their view of America is pretty much dictated by Communist policy. Nearly everyone in these villages has turned to communism as a hope and a means to escape their present misery. In Abruzzi, I found myself in a mountain village of unrecconciled Fascists and monarchists. Their opinion of America was even less realistic than that of the Calabrians and of the northern Friulians I later visited, for if the latter groups saw America as a Marxist caricature, the Abruzzi townspeople likened America to something similar to the green pastures of heaven where everyone was fabulously rich and happy. In these neglected regions of Italy where no Voice of America is heard because there are no radio sets, I believe that my frequent visits have helped these people to understand America a little better; that is, without prejudice."

A 20-year-old war veteran put it this way after a year's study abroad:

"There is no better antidote to the European conception of Americans than a normal, decent American. It is also impressive to these people when you point out that the United States thinks enough of the cultures of foreign nations to send students abroad to study, and is sufficiently proud of its own institutions to allow foreign students to study in the United States in obvious contrast to Russia. These facts tend to make Russophiles, who have never seen a Russian face to face, think."

A Greek doctor, who studied at the Mayo Clinic, returned to Tyre, and set up a 70-bed hospital where he has served more than 40,000 persons in 1 year. Can't we expect a man like this to be influential with his friends and neighbors—and his 40,000 patients—in their attitudes toward America?

A Norwegian student writing about his stay in the United States said:

"I fully appreciate the fact that I was sent to a university in a small town in the Middle West because this has brought me closer to the true America. In the year past, I have been better acquainted with the average Mr. Jones and feel that I can state his honesty, his national feelings, and family life (which I consider the backbone of any nation) is as strong as you will find it anywhere. This fact will not be realized until you have the opportunity to live in the United States of America." (Knut Hange, University of Michigan.)

A Belgian teacher, who spent a year teaching at Proctor High School, in Utica, N. Y., wrote as follows:

"Through traveling and personal contacts, I found that the American people are not the way movies and headlines describe them. Most of my friends in Belgium will be very surprised to learn that Americans actually work, do not drink liquor all day, and do go to church."

Some idea of the importance which the Russian Government has attached to the exchange of persons can be indicated by what they have done in North Korea.

The Advisory Committee on Educational Exchange, in its report to the Congress, said this, quoting from page 2:

"In 1945, some 3,700 North Koreans were enrolled in one or another of the Soviet-oriented cultural societies in that area. By 1949 that number had been increased to over 1,300,000. During the 3-year period prior to 1948, some 770,000 copies of 72 Russian books were published in North Korea. In 1949, some 500 books were translated and



large numbers of copies distributed. For example, of 2 books alone, 537,000 copies were distributed. Numerous classes in the Russian language were organized. Almost 70,000 lectures and concerts were given in North Korea by Soviet artists, writers, and other cultural representatives in 1948 and an even greater number were given in 1949. In the course of the 5-year period preceding hostilities, hundreds of intellectual, industrial, and political leaders from North Korea were taken to Moscow for indoctrination. This provides a vivid illustration of Soviet programs to misguide and seduce a whole population for violent ends."

According to *Fortune* magazine, "Koreans brought to Moscow between 1946 and 1949: 2,600. Brought to United States in same period: 65." (February 1961, note at p. 182.)

It seems significant to me that very many of the leading military and political figures of the Communist-dominated nations were trained in the Soviet. Among them were Mao Tse-tung, of China; Maurice Thorez, of France; Togliatti, of Italy; Kim Il-sung, Premier of North Korea.

Everyone knows that the Soviets are experts in propaganda, and what they do may indicate how they regard exchanges, personal visits—the whole field of person-to-person contact, as a propaganda means.

Of course, their activities are limited by their iron curtain complex. Visits to their country are in the nature of guided tours. Generally the local Communist Party in the country from which the people are to come, bears the responsibility of selecting the delegation. Depending on the nature of the delegation, whether they are workers, students, or farmers, the itinerary of the tour will include model factories, a university, two or three prosperous collective farms, all represented as typical of Soviet life. "Guides" are assigned to each group to insure that no member of the delegation wanders from the prescribed route.

As to the size of this program, let me quote from a statement made by Malik to a British Quaker delegation, which was published in the *London Times* of July 30, 1951. It says: "In 1950 the Soviet Union was visited by 162 foreign delegations from 32 countries comprising 2,134 persons and conversely during the same year, Soviet public and trade-union organizations sent 193 delegations, comprising 1,893 persons to 22 countries. In the first 6 months of 1951, the Soviet Union sent 111 delegations abroad, comprising 1,288 persons, and in the same period the Soviet Union was visited by 110 delegations, comprising 1,366 persons from 28 countries."

A report prepared by the National Committee for a Free Europe indicates the alarming extent of Russian cultural penetration in Hungary. It states that a Russian Institute was established at the Budapest University parallel with an American and an English institute in 1946. But while the last two were disbanded or curtailed, and could never have a resident American and British professor, the Russian Institute was quickly expanded. In April 1950 it had 8 Soviet professors and 540 students. Among the subjects taught by the Russian professors are Russian literature, history and language, political economy and Marxism-Leninism. The Minister of Public Education declared that "the institute is one of the strongholds of Soviet science," and that "the students graduating from this institute would become the most efficient interpreters of Soviet culture and educators of a truly Soviet standard." Several hundred Hungarian college and university students won scholarships to the U. S. S. R. in one year. During the graduation ceremonies at the Institute last summer the Minister of Religion and Public Education declared that, due to the work of the Russian professors, "the institute gives us immense help in fol-

lowing the great Soviet example in our whole public education including university education." Incidentally, the Soviet national anthem was sung at the graduation ceremonies but the Hungarian national anthem was not.

Russian scientists and physicians have frequently visited Hungary, and a Russian doctor was appointed head of a surgical clinic in Budapest. The professors of the Russian Institute also frequently go on lecture tours throughout the country. The official Moscow-trained historian of the regime has directed the Hungarian historians to make more use of the historical achievements of the Soviets in their research.

The Soviet-Hungarian Friendship Months are made special occasions for demonstrating the superiority of Soviet culture. The one held in 1950 far surpassed the one held during the preceding year. A delegation of Soviet scientists, artists and others visited Hungary for this occasion. The Friendship Month was opened by a gala performance at the Budapest Opera House, at which Bardin, the leader of the Soviet delegation and vice-president of the Moscow Academy of Science, addressed the "young Hungarian democracy" as follows: "I am very happy to see that the Hungarian people have made good use of their liberty won with the blood of Soviet soldiers \* \* \*". During the succeeding weeks the members of the Soviet delegation traveled all through the country giving lectures, conducting orchestras, etc. A Russian choir gave a series of concerts and athletic competitions and games were organized, but only—it might be added—in those lines in which the Russian victory could be taken for granted.

Hungarian delegations are frequently sent to the Soviet Union on shorter or longer study tours. Besides being excellent political propaganda, these visits to the U. S. S. R. also serve the cause of Russian cultural penetration. Some 200 peasants went to the U. S. S. R. a year ago to study the Soviet kolkhoz system and groups of scientists and cultural delegations have also been sent to the U. S. S. R.

Although most of the Soviet educational exchanges are confined to satellite countries where it can be reasonably safe to assume that the persons participating will conform to the pattern, a rather considerable exchange program has been conducted with western European and other countries. For example, during recent months meetings of Soviet-sponsored international organizations have been held in Moscow to which countries outside the Soviet orbit have sent delegations. There are numerous reports of exchange of persons' activities between the Soviet Union and France, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, and Iceland. Some of the difficulties of General Eisenhower's job are reflected in the remarks of a member of one of the delegations from the Netherlands who visited Moscow as guests of the Anti-Fascist Women's Committee. Mme. Kogelhof, a member of the Amsterdam Municipal Council, was reported to have said: "In our country war propaganda is being carried on. We are told that we must rearm as a Russian attack is being expected from the East. The peace-loving women of the Netherlands realize, however, that the U. S. S. R. is inhabited by a peace-loving people headed by a peace-loving government. All the things we see here in the U. S. S. R. will be our weapons in the fight for peace."

The following Swedish delegations which visited the U. S. S. R. from September through December 1950 are also typical of those from Norway and Denmark: 14-member woman's delegation recruited from the Swedish Leftist Women's Association, significant Communist-front group of about 2,000 members; 12-member cultural delegation

consisting largely of scientists and artists; 10-member railwaymen's delegation; 8-member building workers' delegation; 9-member shipyard workers' delegation composed largely of representatives from Communist-controlled workshops of the larger Goteborg shipyards.

Various Soviet delegations have visited these countries.

The U. S. S. R. uses Berlin as a channel for its cultural propaganda directed toward West Germany. Soviet-run world congresses are often held there since Berlin is entirely accessible to Communist sympathies in the west. The international congress is held for some worthy cause such as the advancement of women's right, peace, the interchange of ideas among the working class or youth of various nations, and the like. The International Democratic Women's League, the German-Soviet Friendship League, the World Peace Council, the International Students' Union, and the World Federation of Democratic Youth have held meetings in Berlin this year, and Soviet delegations were present at all of them. In addition, three cultural delegations, two youth delegations, and two labor delegations have been sent from Eastern Germany to the U. S. S. R.

There are also exchange of persons activities between the U. S. S. R. and the near- and middle-eastern countries. In April of this year, 10 Indian authors and journalists and 14 professors, educators, scientists, engineers, and social workers were invited by (the U. S. S. R. "Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries") to make a study tour of the U. S. S. R. in order to promote cultural relations between the two countries. A prominent Soviet motion picture producer and director and a leading Soviet actor visited India a few months ago to promote mutual understanding between India and the U. S. S. R. During their tour they met informally and discussed motion-picture techniques with movie workers.

A Soviet hospital in Iran, now called the Red Cross Hospital is reported to have a staff of 11 Soviet doctors. A 3-man Soviet medical delegation attended a medical conference held in Pakistan several months ago. While there they found time to visit hospitals and to deliver a few lectures.

The Patriarch of Antioch, Syria, has been on a visit to the U. S. S. R. this summer, having been invited to Moscow to attend the August meeting of the Theological Academy. A delegation of 163 persons which included over a hundred Lebanese, 40 Iraqis, 3 Iranians, and 2 Syrians, attended the Berlin rally of the Federation of World Students.

As these instances indicate, Soviet Russia is undoubtedly aware of the importance of the exchange of persons, as a propaganda weapon. However, it is also clear that such programs have positive inherent advantages for those who rely upon the truth as an ally. The Russian police state dares not use this means, except for those who are already thoroughly indoctrinated in the Communist philosophy, or those who can be conducted for short periods of time on guided tours to see the best that lies behind the iron curtain. The Russians dare not use this program with free people, who are skeptical or open-minded. They can spread confusion with their technique of the big lie. They can rewrite history, they can build as powerful broadcasting stations as we can. They can stage mammoth youth congresses, print thousands of newspapers. But the masters of the Kremlin will never, so long as they maintain the despotic subjugation of their people, allow students and leaders, newspapermen, farmers, businessmen, and laborers from all over the world to move freely about Russia to see and report to the world what they see. Likewise they cannot afford to let their people either fraternize with the foreign visitor to Russia or go out into the world and observe for themselves how free



people live. So this program is the most effective we have in the propaganda war—the war of ideas. Not only is it effective in itself, but like a well-protected patent we have a monopoly upon its use, as against the Soviet. There is no statement, no lie, no truth for that matter, that can be nearly as persuasive as the invitation: "If you don't believe it, come and see for yourself."

We should exploit this advantage which we have over the Soviet by an expanded program of exchanging students, teachers, leaders, and molders of opinion in those countries which are now our friends and which we hope will become our friends.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, for the reasons set forth by me and other reasons which I do not have time to explain now, I oppose the committee amendment, and I hope that the Senate will increase the amount to \$85,000,000.

There are one or two aspects of the question which are a little complicated and difficult to explain. One is in regard to the foreign sums which the committee report mentions. Under the 1950 program \$2,500,000 was allowed, and it is said that we are giving \$5,000,000 now. Therefore, the amount is twice as much as for 1950.

I desire to remind the Senate again that there are 11 countries now which are expected to be in the coming program, which were not in the 1950 program; and in addition to that, because of the use of foreign credits under the bill which I sponsored, which are taken account of in this appropriation, the money which occurs in the form of credits which arose from surplus property do not appear in the bill at all.

When the emphasis in the program is upon taking Americans abroad, there is a relatively small expenditure of appropriated dollars; but as we increase the number of foreign students to this country, that increases the demands on dollar funds to pay their expenses while they are in this country. Our experience has shown very clearly that one of the most important parts of this whole program is the bringing of foreign students to this country, to let them see whether it is a weakened civilization we have in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. If I may, I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, without taking up the time of the Senator from New Jersey, my recollection is—and if I am in error, I shall be glad to stand corrected—the Senator from South Dakota had utilized his 22 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. No. I used only 9 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, how does the time stand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota used 9 minutes of his time.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator still has the rest of the 22 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. And the Senator from Arizona has about 5 or 6 minutes left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 6½ minutes left.

Mr. HAYDEN. That could not be.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Nevada has 45 minutes, I might add.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 45 minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yielded 3 minutes and 8 minutes. That makes 11 minutes. That should be subtracted from the 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona yielded 8, 3, and 5 minutes. That makes 16 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. And he had only 11.

Mr. HAYDEN. I had 22½.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona had 22½ minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. So that means that I have 6½ minutes left, does it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is the time for this discussion to be charged to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not charged to the time of the Senator from New Jersey. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I rise at this point to speak both in my own behalf and in behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. But primarily I speak for my colleague whose manuscript I use in his absence.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, my able colleague is engaged in the performance of a very sad mission made necessary by the passing of his twin and only brother, to whom he was exceedingly devoted.

I strongly support the amendment to restore to the international information and educational activities of the Department of State the appropriation of \$85,000,000 approved by the House. In considering this amendment it should be clearly borne in mind that this figure represents a cut of 26 percent in the amount requested for 1952, and a cut of 20 percent in the 1951 appropriation. The lower figure recommended by the Senate committee would result in a cut of 45 percent in the amount requested and a cut of 41 percent in the 1951 appropriation.

Such a drastic cut in the information and education program as that recommended by the Senate committee fails to do justice either to the tremendous importance of the battle for the minds and spirits of men, or to the essential fact that an effective information and education program must be a major weapon in that battle. In my considered judgment we have not yet done nearly enough to inform and educate the peoples of the world on the objectives and principles and way of life of the United States, on our common alle-

giance with them to the ideals of human freedom, and on the true nature of the Communist threat. Furthermore, while the senior Senator from New Jersey has been one of those who have constantly urged improvement in various aspects of our informational and educational program, he thinks the facts justify the statement that the program has become increasingly effective—and increasingly important—in the past 3 years. It is significant that the Senate committee report does not deny the effectiveness or the importance of the program, and contains no justification for this severe cut.

So much has already been said about the importance of the battle for the minds and spirits of men that I shall not dwell on it at length now. Let me just point out that our whole foreign policy program has, of necessity, been increasingly focused on purely military questions during the past year. This has been, let me repeat, an inevitable and necessary trend in the light of the critical world situation. But it entails grave dangers. We may become so concentrated on purely military considerations that we fail to retain the proper perspective in our view of the over-all nature of the current world struggle between the forces of freedom and the forces of Soviet communism. Certainly no one can maintain that an expenditure of \$85,000,000 for informational and educational activities is too great when we realize that this represents only two-tenths of 1 percent of the approximately 50,000,000,000 of dollars that we shall appropriate for military purposes during the fiscal year 1952.

There is one aspect of this total program that I have always watched particularly closely because it is authorized by legislation sponsored by the senior Senator from New Jersey in the Senate, and by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] who was then a Member of the House. I refer to the educational exchange activities as provided for in the Smith-Mundt Act—some of which, incidentally, are essential also for full effectiveness of the exchanges under the Fulbright Act. The Senate report indicates that a total of \$5,000,000 would be appropriated for exchange of persons, as contrasted with an appropriation of over \$6,000,000,000 last year and a request for about \$10,500,000 for 1952.

The proposed 1952 program would have permitted a modest increase in the number of persons in all of the various categories exchanged under the provisions of the Smith-Mundt Act. The amount recommended by the Senate committee would obviously mean a sharp reduction in the number of persons, even though the Department is expected by the committee to initiate exchange programs with countries not now included, such as Iceland, Ireland, and Spain.

Fortunately we have had the benefit of the views of an expert Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange which has watched this program very carefully since its inauguration in 1948. This Commission has been composed of outstanding men in the field of educa-



tion: Harvie Branscomb, chancellor of Vanderbilt University, is chairman; the remaining five members are Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton University; Mark Starr, educational director of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; Edwin B. Fred, president of the University of Wisconsin; and Martin R. P. McGuire, professor at Catholic University.

In its most recent report to Congress this Commission stated that the job of carrying on the educational program "has been well done." The program has had, according to the Commission, vigorous and forward-looking leadership. The Commission says, finally, "we are unanimous in reporting to the Congress that steady progress has been made over this 3-year period in this indispensable but relatively new undertaking. We urge for it increased attention and constructive criticism by the Congress and the public, and further financial support." In other words, the program is not perfect, but it has been capably handled and continuously improved, it is essential, and it justifies the increased support of Congress and the people.

This Commission recognizes that it is impossible to prove just how effective the program has been. I agree with this, but I would like to present very briefly to the Senate an experience which the senior Senator from New Jersey had recently which impressed him deeply concerning the impact of the program.

Early last year he was visited by a Smith-Mundt grantee from a European country who was a journalist and who came over here as a specialist. There was a considerable bloc of public opinion in his native country that favored neutrality as between the free world and the Soviet bloc. This particular man was a supporter of this point of view and wrote for a newspaper which represented the so-called neutralist position. The senior Senator from New Jersey talked with this young man at some length on several occasions. He got to know many people in this country, especially those in the newspaper profession. Gradually he came to understand our principles and our objectives. When he returned to his native country his whole point of view had changed and he realized the futility of the neutralist position. In fact he resigned his position with his newspaper and became an advocate of the concept of mutual security for the free world, encouraging his people to build up their defensive power and their will to resist communism in full collaboration with the United States.

Now I do not claim that our educational exchange program is as successful as this in every case. Obviously it is not. Undoubtedly we can improve our techniques of handling the people we bring over here so that we can select more persons in key positions, make sure that they get the fullest possible view of our way of life, and can follow up after they leave this country to evaluate the effectiveness of our program. But I am convinced that of the 3,500 individuals that were brought to this country under the Government program last year, the vast

majority returned to their native lands as friends of the United States and as champions of freedom.

The senior Senator from New Jersey urges, and urges strongly, that every Member of the Senate consider very carefully the necessity for maintaining a vigorous and strong information and education program as an integral part of our foreign relations activities. In my judgment, this cannot be done with the drastic cut in appropriation recommended by the Senate committee. Restoration of the \$85,000,000 figure approved by the House is the very least that we can do in this essential area, and it is the hope of the senior Senator from New Jersey that the amendment to accomplish this will be overwhelmingly approved by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me two more minutes?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield one additional minute to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as one of the cosponsors of the pending amendment, I associate myself with everything my distinguished colleague has had to say on the subject of this restoration.

The junior Senator from New Jersey joins his colleague in the hope that the amendment in question will be overwhelmingly agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the committee amendment, as it appeared to the subcommittee and to the committee as a whole, provided sufficient money to operate effectively the Voice of America and the other allied facilities in the international information and education program, to give to the world America's side in the cold war between the propaganda of Russia and the propaganda of America.

I have had some occasion to visit the battlefronts in this cold war for the minds of men and to observe its progress. I think the main thing we have to learn is the fact that Russia has a technique which we have never adopted and which we do not seem to sense as being the fundamentally necessary technique. The Communists use the voice and the mind of the native in spreading their propaganda. That is their method of selling their product. In that way it costs them less than it costs the United States. We seem to be unable, somehow, to obtain sufficient minds and sufficient tongues in the other nations to carry out the ideas and ideals of America in the world in which we want particular nations to become partners.

It may be said that the necessity for adopting this basic technique does not apply behind the iron curtain. That is exactly where it would apply. Russians come more or less freely into America. As proceedings go forward in the Senate's Internal Security Committee hearings it is clear how Russia penetrates this country and propagandizes us by the

using of Americans and people who are giving information to Americans.

The Senator from Michigan believes that as much information as possible should be sent to the people behind the iron curtain. He believes that all steps which are really effective should be taken by ourselves and by the partnership of freemen of which we are a member, to make that a successful partnership, a partnership which will bring peace to the world. In the course of our hearings, however, we found that if a Czech makes a speech over the Voice of America, certain Czechs, both in this country and in Czechoslovakia itself, resent the fact that we have used a member of another party than theirs to do the broadcasting. We found the same to be true with respect to certain other countries, when other languages were used. When false information is put out over the Voice of America we are not doing anything good for America.

Mr. President, I have come to the conclusion that the trouble with the Voice of America—and I use the popular descriptive term to include not only the radio programs but all the other phases of the program—is that those having it in charge are trying to do too much. They remind me of the man who tried to do too much, and did. They are trying to give quantity instead of quality. They believe that if we spend dollars we will be successful. That, however, is not the way to obtain success. Success is obtained by use of quality rather than quantity. Success is not to be measured by the dollars available or the number of dollars spent.

Mr. President, this is the picture. The program for 1950 cost \$35,010,187—in round figures \$35,000,000. In 1951 the program cost \$70,148,637. That is in addition to \$50,821,939 for capital outlay. This year the Voice of America asks for \$115,000,000. That means an increase from \$35,000,000 in 1950, to \$70,000,000 in 1951, and a request for the fiscal year 1952, \$115,000,000. That represents a request for an increase of 330 percent in 2 years. Using the \$85,000,000 in the proposed amendment as a base it is an increase of about 150 percent.

If that increase meant peace, or proportionate progress toward peace, it would be cheap enough. But peace cannot be purchased, nor can good will. Nor can the success of this program be assured merely by making more dollars available to it.

Mr. President, let us address ourselves to one basic and real consideration. It is simply a physical impossibility to secure men who are skilled and able and capable of doing a good job and to do it as quickly as is proposed to be done by the proposed 130 percent or the proposed 150 percent increase.

Mr. President, examples of the type of propaganda that has been sent out have been given on the floor of the Senate. I want to add my own example. When I, together with several other Senators, were in New Delhi 2 years ago we saw an American moving picture of bathing beauties at Atlantic City. Did those who sent the picture there believe they were impressing the Moslems and



the Hindus by displaying the bathing beauties of America at Atlantic City? Mr. President, they certainly were not impressing a people to whom any display of the human form is offensive.

The year following I was again in India and we saw in Calcutta a picture made by the Russians. The picture was entitled "A Day in Russia." It was real propaganda for the Russians. By whom was it sponsored? We were there during a festival week, and the picture was sponsored by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Calcutta. We paid an admission fee into the theater to see the Russian propaganda film. When the bathing-beauty picture was shown in New Delhi, the people were invited to come in and see it without cost, but with little success. It was a movie that our own people would have understood and appreciated, but it simply did not fit the bill for presentation in India and its success was not assisted by its free showing.

In that contrast between the success of the Russian film and the American film there are revealed the sort of mistakes which we must avoid. They are mistakes which are not to be cured simply by making more money available to our Voice program. Let me repeat. The test of our offensive in this cold war is quality, and quantity is no substitute.

Mr. President, I wish earnestly to see the Voice of America successful in waging the cold war. I think a good program can be put out if it is given proper supervision, and is prepared by proper personnel. It takes a great deal of time to train such personnel. It is difficult to secure personnel who really understand not only what they are selling but the markets in which they must do their selling. It is important that we sell the high ideals of America. It is vital that we present convincing arguments to the people of the world that what we have here by way of high standards of living, the material things we have and use, are but the fruits of the system which exists in America, and that we really want a free world in which such benefits can be enjoyed by all people. A well-conceived and not just a well-financed program is the essential prerequisite.

I say, Mr. President, that we can obtain a good program by providing the money recommended to be given by the Committee on Appropriations. With \$63,000,000, those in charge of the program can keep a diligent watch over it. The personnel which is not trained, which is not capable of selling the ideals of America, should be cut out. I say categorically that if we allow \$63,000,000 for the program, a better job will be done by the Voice of America than if we give \$85,000,000 for the program. The latter figure is an invitation not just to waste but to ineffectiveness, and it is effectiveness that we all seek. The amount recommended by the committee is entirely adequate to provide for a concentration upon fundamental programs and basic techniques which will assure the effectiveness we all want in carrying our message to the people of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, no one in the subcommittee nor in the full committee had any desire to cripple or destroy the program. It was the desire of the members of the Appropriations Committee to see to it that the program went forward, but that no money should be thrown away. We have heard a great deal said today about the Voice of America. The Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate gave to it every dollar that the Bureau of the Budget recommended for the Voice of America. The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$25,164,655. That is the exact amount that is contained in the bill for the Voice of America.

Much has been said about the fine propaganda that should be put out over the air. We agree with what has been said on that point. We say that nothing should go over the air through the Voice of America save and except that which will bring to the attention of the countries whose people we seek to influence what can be done for their betterment if they take a stand on our side on the question of freedom in democracy as compared with slavery under communism. That is the object the committee had in recommending the full amount asked by the Bureau of the Budget. Does the Senate of the United States now want to exceed the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget? I think not. Yet we are being asked to exceed that amount.

That is not the controversy here. There have been many who have been lobbying for an increase in this item. If the same amount of time had been devoted to trying to improve the program over the air as has been devoted to packing these corridors for the past several days, we might have a better program going out over the air from America.

Twenty-five million dollars was allowed by the budget. Twenty-five million dollars is allowed by the committee. But that is not what they want. What have they been doing? Pamphlets, magazines, and publications of all kinds and descriptions have been sent out. Let me show the Senate one of those publications. I hold in my hand a publication which has gone out by the authority of the Department of State. I also hold in my hand a photostatic copy of an order to certain American diplomatic and consular officers. It reads in part as follows:

The Secretary of State desires to call the attention of the officer in charge to the American periodical entitled "The Reporter."

Under separate cover, a packet of recent issues of The Reporter is being sent with the compliments of the publisher to each United States library and reading room for which subscriptions have not previously been entered. Each package is identical and will contain selected issues of the periodical dealing with the themes and subjects of special interest and applicability to the Department's programs and to particular geographic areas.

In the last paragraph we find the following:

It may also be considered appropriate for presentation purposes, and requests for presentation subscriptions will be considered within the limitations of the funds available.

Mind you, Mr. President, this is going out by action of the State Department. The Voice of America, if you please, paid for by American taxpayers' dollars, puts out this material. Let us see what is being spread over the world. Perhaps I should be somewhat elated and complimented. These publications have been sent to Athens, Salonika, Bagdad, Buenos Aires, Cairo, Copenhagen, Damascus, Dublin, Helsinki, Madrid, Manila, Monrovia, New Delhi, Bangkok, Stockholm, and other cities. Perhaps I should be especially interested in this headline. This is what they want the world to be influenced by, through the use of American dollars. The headline is, "McCARRAN's monopoly." Listen to this:

The Nevada Senator has become judge, prosecutor, and hangman in loyalty cases. \* \* \* The chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee has, over the last 6 months, managed to establish himself as grand inquisitor and lord high executioner in charge of the extirpation of heresy.

Further:

The odds are all in favor of the new group—

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who is advocating this amendment to the committee amendment, will undoubtedly be inflated with this:

The odds are all in favor of the new group. It has as a sort of unofficial publicity man Senator KARL E. MUNDT.

That is the kind of material for which another several million dollars is asked. As a matter of fact, the committee allowed every single dollar the Budget Bureau requested. The Department is not curtailed in the least in anything it does over the air. Shall the iron curtain be penetrated with this kind of material? No. That is not what the money of the taxpayers should be used for. Is this the reason why it is desired to vote a sum in addition to that provided by the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Does the language used in that publication resemble the party line language of the Communist Party?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. It resembles certain party line language—not the party to which the able Senator from Idaho belongs.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am advised over the telephone that the circular letter which the Senator read was written a year ago, at which time certain packages of the magazine referred to, consisting of back numbers, were sent out.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. At that time those who received the packages were advised that if subscriptions were desired they could be obtained. As a matter of fact, the State Department has not sent out more than about 20 subscriptions. Is that the Senator's information?

Mr. MUNDT. Forty-two.



Mr. HAYDEN. What is the total number of magazines which have been sent out since attention was first called to this matter?

Mr. McCARRAN. Two hundred and fifty-four. Let me read something along that line. The data with respect to distribution of other publications at New Delhi shows:

Time magazine, departmental subscriptions, 2; Saturday Evening Post, 2; Collier's, 2; the Reporter, 101.

That is the publication from which I have read.

The Reporter, to New Delhi—101.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator mean to say that the Department is now paying for 101 subscriptions?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am reading from reports from the Department.

Reader's Digest, 100.

Newsweek, 220.

Newsweek came up.

Life magazine, 60.

Total cost for 1 year for the Reporter, for 280 subscriptions, and mailing charges—cost to Department, \$4 per subscription per year. Regular subscription \$5; \$1,897.84.

The circulation of the Reporter, as given by the publisher, is only 25,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The information the Senator gives is surprising to me, because my understanding was that a very limited number were sent out—between 20 and 40.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know. That was the statement made before the committee of which the able Senator is a member, the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. How could the Department possibly spend millions of dollars unless it sent out great numbers of publications? It would not need millions of dollars for a few subscriptions.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Another piece of information I was given by the Department was that no copies of the issue containing the derogatory remarks with respect to the Senator from Nevada were sent out. I am informed that none of them have been sent abroad.

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh, Mr. President—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to reply to the Senator from Arizona.

This is from the issue of the Reporter of June 26, 1951. The other was August 21, 1951.

#### CUT-RATE ALLIES

It is a strange coincidence that Franco's Spain and Chinese Formosa seem to be able to provide just about the same elastic number of soldiers; between half a million and a million. This at least is the estimate that Senator PAT McCARRAN made recently in an article on Franco's Spain, published in the Saturday Evening Post. In both cases, of course, we are offered raw material, not the finished product. The soldiers have to be

trained or retrained, equipped, and fed. But Franco's and Chiang's middlemen say, we could never find a better buy.

That is one example. Let me cite another.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to finish my answer to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. I apologize to the Senator from New York.

The Reporter—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have some more information on this point. In the issue of January 23, 1951, at page 11, there is a picture of the senior Senator from Nevada. Mr. President, if I wanted publicity, I would be in favor of the amendment which is now under consideration. I get a great deal of publicity in this magazine. I go all over the world in this magazine. They know me all over the world. I get more publicity in this magazine than in any other. I have before me another article. It is scathing and scurrilous. Is this why we want to raise the appropriation for the program? Mr. President, it just cannot be. I yield now to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada gave some figures which show that the Voice of America subscribed for approximately 280 copies.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. At a cost of \$4.40?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; per copy.

Mr. LEHMAN. Per copy. It makes a total of slightly more than \$1,000. Do I understand that the Senator from Nevada wishes to cut out \$22,000,000 for that reason?

Mr. McCARRAN. No. It is the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, not the Senator from Nevada, that wishes to make the reduction.

Mr. LEHMAN. But it is proposed now, because \$1,000 has been expended for that purpose—and I am not discussing the merits of the action—

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the Senator from New York asking a question, or is he making a speech?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not going to make a speech. I will stick to my question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. I wish that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] would not leave the floor for a minute. It was stated in the Committee on Appropriations that the issue of August 21 had been stopped. They said they had sent out a wire several days before that to stop it. Let us see how truthful they were about it. We asked them when they had sent out the wire. They said the wire had been sent out on August 20, 1951. They gave us a list of the places to which they had sent it to stop the issue of August 21 from being circulated. That magazine had been going out by their knowledge for months before that time. If it was not by their knowledge, it should have been by their knowledge.

They said the wire was sent out on the 20th of August. It was on the 21st of August that I drew the matter to the attention of the Committee on Appro-

priations at about 3:30 in the afternoon, on the reconvening of the committee. When did they say they had sent the wire? I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of the wire which was sent. It was sent on August 21 at 4:35 p. m., after the matter had been brought to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate. It was not sent before that time. It was not sent on the 20th, but on the 21st, after the matter had been brought to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, that is the stuff with which we are dealing in this agency. That is why some of us want to curtail the appropriation. We want to take hold of this situation and straighten it out, so that at least we can get some propaganda going forward which will do some good to America in her struggle against her enemies at home and abroad.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. BENTON. Is the Senator from Nevada familiar with the long list of approved magazines, put out by the State Department?

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh yes; I am. I have not had time to go through the long list of magazines. I have the list, however. I suppose the Senator from Connecticut is referring to the same list. I have the list.

Mr. BENTON. Is the Senator aware of the fact that there are more than 400 magazines on the list, and that the Reporter is not among the 50 or so magazines which are automatically sent to the information libraries abroad?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is probably so. No doubt someone did not want to publicize the fact that they were sending these scurrilous statements abroad. That is probably true.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada has read the magazine Life, the magazine Time, and other magazines, which advocates the dismissal of Secretary Acheson. Would he suggest that as a reason why Life magazine, for example, should not be sent to our information libraries abroad?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have not paid any attention to it. That may be true.

Mr. BENTON. Has the Senator ever been criticized in the New York Times, in Time magazine, or in other periodicals; and if so, would he suggest that it would be a good reason for not sending such publications to the information libraries abroad?

Mr. McCARRAN. But American dollars were not taken out of the pockets of American taxpayers to pay for that stuff. American taxpayers' money is being put out for this stuff.

Mr. BENTON. There are more than 50—

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator from Connecticut will propound his question I shall try to answer it.

Mr. BENTON. Does the Senator from Nevada know that there are more than 50 magazines which are bought with taxpayers' money and sent to the libraries abroad?



Mr. McCARRAN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BENTON. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the Reporter is not one of them?

Mr. McCARRAN. Probably.

Mr. BENTON. Is the Senator from Nevada aware also that in the 50 magazines Members of Congress, Members of the Senate, members of the administration, and President Truman are criticized?

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator want taxpayers' money to pay for this stuff to be sent to New Delhi and other places around the world so that it can be shown to people who do not understand our way of life and how we quarrel among ourselves? Is that what the Senator wants to do?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not the Reporter magazine an opinion magazine, rather than a fact magazine?

Mr. McCARRAN. The magazine is nothing but an opinion magazine. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What publication outside of the World Almanac would the Senator call a fact magazine?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know. There are so many magazines, I do not believe I could answer the Senator's question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What does the Senator suggest for purposes of publicity, propaganda, and information? Does he suggest that we set up a Government bureau?

Mr. McCARRAN. We are dealing with a Government bureau.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I mean with respect to publications that should be sent abroad. Should we stop buying the Saturday Evening Post, for example?

Mr. McCARRAN. No, but I would make sure of what was going into an issue of the Saturday Evening Post which we were sending abroad. I would scrutinize it to see whether it contained statements to the effect that we are in a mess and quarreling among ourselves. I would not peddle that stuff to the world. I would see whether it contained that kind of stuff or whether it showed that we have something to offer to the people of the world.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a final question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BENTON. The Chicago Tribune and the Washington Times-Herald have been running some unfriendly editorials about me. Does the Senator from Nevada feel that I would be justified in opposing on the floor of the Senate the sending of the Chicago Tribune and Times-Herald to our information libraries abroad?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; but if the taxpayers of America were paying taxes to send them, I would say they should not go, because it does not show anything along democratic lines.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How can we send the New York Times to our information libraries abroad, or Newsweek, to which the Senator has referred, or any of the other periodicals which contain criticisms of the Members of the Senate? That is the glory of the American press.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know whether it is the idea of the Senator that we should send that kind of stuff out to the world, to be absorbed, so that Russia can say, "Look for yourselves. They are grappling at each other's throats in America. They are calling each other names in America." If that is the kind of stuff we want to send abroad, I surrender.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not a choice between a free press and censorship?

Mr. McCARRAN. Is the Senator asking me a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Is not the Senator from Nevada posing a choice between a free press, backed by taxpayers' money, sent to the libraries abroad, or setting up censorship?

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all. I want something that shows the value of my country. I want to show what American life is like. I want something that shows that democracy is worth while. I want something which will draw the attention of the Russian people to their great and gallant leaders of days gone by so that they can say, "We will follow them. We will bring about a revolution here, and we will aid America so that there can be a free Russia and a free Russian people." That is what I want.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the Senator's desire to make this positive and constructive approach, which is commendable, just how would he suggest we should do it? Does the Senator suggest that we set up a Government propaganda mill to grind out favorable pamphlets?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or does the Senator suggest that we rely upon the private-enterprise system and a free press?

Mr. McCARRAN. We can set up an agency by the very plan we have now, and for which we are appropriating; and that agency will select the proper statements to be issued, through the press that is selected, to gain a certain aim and object. That aim and object should be to extol this country and our form of government and to bring to the attention of the people of the countries whom we seek to touch what they themselves can do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How would the Senator judge who would be the proper authority to determine what was proper? For instance, I might notice in the Saturday Evening Post an article which I did not like at all. If so, should I be opposed to having the Saturday Evening Post sent out?

Mr. McCARRAN. Someone should have the authority to determine that something other than this magazine, the Reporter, should go out. Will the Senator agree that some of the articles in the magazine, the Reporter, should not go out?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I cannot say, because there are in the magazine some articles with which I am in agreement.

Why should we deny the rest of the world the luxury which we enjoy here at home—the luxury of criticizing each other?

Mr. McCARRAN. Let us see about the American press. I read now from one of the 1950 issues of the Reporter:

We have no Communist problem in our country. We have the Communists, several thousands of them, to deal with and take care of.

Is that along the party line? Is that material which we wish to have sent out?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield first to the Senator from South Dakota, who has been seeking recognition for some little time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in the case of the magazine, the Reporter, which the Senator from Nevada has been mentioning, will the Senator take the position that instead of the issue before us being that of a free press, it is the issue of establishing a subsidized press, if the program of sending out the Reporter goes on?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not believe I understand the Senator's question.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that The Reporter is a magazine which has very few subscriptions; and I believe that if it were not for the subscription of the State Department to that magazine, the magazine the Reporter would have so few subscriptions that it would have to go out of business.

Mr. McCARRAN. Probably the Senator from South Dakota is correct as to that.

I am wondering why this publication is issued at all, unless someone has something which he wishes to have disseminated throughout the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In reference to the question asked by the Senator from South Dakota as to subsidization, let me suggest to the Senator that he consider the subsidy being given to the magazines of this country, by means of which several copies of a magazine can be sent through the mail for the cost of mailing one first-class letter. That is a real subsidy.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, if I have sufficient time to yield.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well; I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Can the Senator from Nevada tell me what good the so-called propaganda in that magazine would do, by being sent throughout the world to people who would learn of our great democracy, inasmuch as when that magazine goes to the Communists, and is read



by them, it gives them material with which to blast us in the eyes of a country which we expect to have on our side. It seems to me that in such a case we would be laughed right out of a country which received such scurrilous literature as that.

Mr. McCARRAN. All I can do is submit the matter to the Senate and abide by the judgment of the Senate. I do not care to attempt to influence the judgment of this great body.

All I want the Senate to know is that the Appropriations Committee did the very best it could under the conditions relating to this entire program. We have voted to give them the sixty-three-million-dollar-odd to go forward with, and we have voted to give them all that the Bureau of the Budget authorized to be given to them, so far as the radio program is concerned.

So far as these publications are concerned, we believe they should be cut down until a time when this agency can come before the Appropriations Committee and can show that it is putting out something worthy of the money it is expending.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator whether the State Department itself has decided—if we may judge so by its telegram to the various embassies, in an attempt to stop the sending or the giving out of this information—that the magazine contains an article which should not be sent out as the Voice of America.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is no question about that.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator kindly point out the budget item under which these magazines are distributed?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, they are distributed under the second item in the list on page 10 of the report. The item is called "Press and Publications."

Mr. McFARLAND. The estimate is only \$11,000,000, and the total budget item is \$115,000,000; and the committee's recommendation would reduce it to \$63,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is right, and this is one of the items.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] that the issues dated from August 1950 to the latest issue, that for August 21, 1951, carried the following main themes; and I am referring now to the issues of the magazine the Reporter:

Belittling Spain and Communist China.

Attacks on myself.

Playing down the dangers of communism in the United States.

A thinly veiled diatribe against communism in general, but always with the undertones that certain legislators are making much ado about nothing.

Attacks on any loyalty program in the Government.

A play on the red-herring theme.

Beginning in June 1951, an intensive program on the new Communist line, trying to show Red China and Spain as similar cases, and urging that because we recognize the former we should recognize the latter.

Those are items in the issues through which I have had an opportunity to go in the last few days. I knew nothing about this magazine until just a few days ago. I am bringing it to the attention of the Senate now.

I wish to emphasize that if this magazine, which I have described to the Senate today, and these articles have been tolerated—as they have been—to such an extent that the Department putting out this magazine absolutely falsified to the Senate Appropriations Committee, when the Department's representatives said they had stopped sending the magazine abroad, when, as a matter of fact, they did not send the telegram or wire until after this matter was presented to the Senate Appropriations Committee—and I have here, on display, a photostatic copy of that communication—if this group will go that far, how much further will it go with the money we place in its hands?

Is it not better for us now to halt that game, and then let us see what they can do in reorganizing this agency and in bringing it into line, in carrying on the program which the Congress authorized some years ago, and which I now support and have supported for years with all my power?

However, I cannot support and I will not support a lavish throwing away of the money of the taxpayers of the Nation.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I wish to be sure that I clearly understand the Senator from Nevada. Does he mean that everything in the nature of printed material to be sent abroad by the Voice of America should be brought to the Senate Appropriations Committee for its inspection and approval before it is sent, including the New York Times, the Reader's Digest, the Saturday Evening Post, the Christian Science Monitor, Life magazine, the United States News & World Report, and similar magazines? What is the position of the Senator on that point? I wish to understand him.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will answer the Senator from Connecticut with his own words: It was his own position, because the committee of which he is a member adopted a resolution on that very subject, and I supported it.

Mr. McMAHON. But I was against it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, the Senator from Connecticut was against almost everything, was he not?

Mr. McMAHON. No, I do not think so.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It is my understanding that through its regular channels, the State Department issues numerous publications which are circulated under the Voice of America pro-

gram. Does the Senator from Nevada know whether the staff of the Appropriations Committee or of any other committee has made a survey, to check upon the accuracy or the quality of those publications? I am not referring to the publications which have been mentioned thus far in the debate, but it is my understanding that there are numerous other publications which are sponsored by, edited by, and issued by certain agencies of the Department of State. Can the Senator tell us about those publications?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot give the Senator that information because I have not had an opportunity to go through that material. But in answer to the Senator from Connecticut, I again draw his attention to the fact that the committee of which he is a member, and of which the senior Senator from Nevada is a member, very recently approved a declaration that this whole matter should be brought before the Congress of the United States, and that some agency should be established to go over this line of literature, to see what is going on.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is that my time on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on the committee amendment is 1 hour and 30 minutes, of which the Senator has 45 minutes. The time of the Senator from Nevada has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Do I not have time remaining on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not yet been offered. When it is offered, the Senator will then have time on the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator will then have 20 minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, this situation emphasizes the belief which I had when we entered into the unanimous-consent agreement, that it was not altogether fair because there has been raised in this debate an extremely important question which should be discussed. That question is whether we are going to set up a censorship by the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate with respect to the material which goes to the embassies and legations of the United States throughout the earth. That is a very dangerous thesis, Mr. President.

But I should like to get away from the Reporter for a moment. I have read very few issues. The ones I have read I have found interesting. I agree with some of them, and with some of them I do not agree. I find myself, as I imagine the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and all Members of this body find themselves, in agreement and disagreement with much of that which is printed in the periodicals and press of the United States. But, Mr. President, that is the free way. It is the American way. It is not the Soviet way,



which is the way of uniformity imposed upon everyone on peril of being liquidated, of being taken to Siberia, if he does not subscribe to it. May there never be a Siberia in the United States of America applied to the minds of men. I think it was Thomas Jefferson who said that he swore eternal enmity to those who would exercise tyranny over the minds of men; and apparently there is an attempt to be made here to exercise exactly that kind of tyranny. But enough of that.

Mr. President, the Soviet Union can have all the guns and all the planes and all the bombs, but if it does not have the people, it cannot make successful war on us. All the \$70,000,000,000 or \$75,000,000,000 which we are spending on our own part for weapons and for defense needs to be spent, and we must spend it in order to counterbalance the military power of the Kremlin. I must confess that I would sooner balance that military power than balance the budget of the United States, despite the fact that I should very much like to see the budget balanced.

But, Mr. President, the only way by which we can achieve some degree of disaffection within the Soviet Union is to get our message to the Russian people and other peoples behind the iron curtain, and the only way we can do that is through the Voice of America, and through the program which is being advanced at this time. It involves a very small sum of money, indeed, for this assault on the iron curtain—an iron curtain in which they have demonstrated that they will spend untold millions of dollars to maintain.

Is our program effective? Read the statements of those who spend their time in the satellite countries and in Soviet Russia denouncing the Voice of America and our propaganda.

Furthermore, I should like to point out to the Senate that there is a committee which we caused to be created, which comprises as eminent citizens of the United States as could be gathered together, citizens who are expert in the field of public relations, who have testified on their honor to the people of America and to the Congress that this program is efficient, that it is worth while, and that it is a contribution to the defense and the security of the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. McMAHON. Will the Senator from Arizona yield me one-half minute more?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield a half minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for an additional half minute.

Mr. McMAHON. In these 30 seconds, I merely desire to say that if we are to prevent world war III, a war which would cause the absolute destruction of civilization as we know it, it will be necessary for us to carry the offensive behind the iron curtain. If we fall in that effort the war will come. If we succeed in the effort, we shall avoid war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a brief statement which I have prepared on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR McMAHON

No. 1. For 30 years we Americans have been talking to ourselves while the Communists have made us the targets of the most vicious calumny and blackmail campaign in human annals.

Of course we Americans are proud of our wonderful free press, our free radio, our superb magazines and publications. But who reads or listens to them? For the most part, Americans only.

Yes; we have been talking to ourselves, extolling liberty and condemning tyranny, while at the same time we have allowed these Communist conspirators to blacken our good name and reputation at the four corners of the earth.

A few years ago we started to do something about it—we started to export what may be our finest export product—the free press and the free radio of the United States. We call this product the Voice of America and already there is ample evidence that it is doing an excellent job of spiking Soviet lies and propaganda.

The so-called Voice of America is simply the American radio, American newspapers, and American magazines transported overseas and made available for foreign audiences. In my judgment, this is the most potent peace force we have. In my judgment, we are bound to win friends and influence people wherever we are able to distribute the free press and radio of the United States.

I believe the Voice of America is just as necessary to our people in these perilous times as the human voice is to the human individual. We must have the means to communicate with our potential friends overseas. I sincerely believe that if we cripple or weaken the "Voice" at this time, if we reduce it to a squeak or a whisper, we are giving the Soviets a frightful handicap in the battle for men's minds.

No. 2. This year alone, we will appropriate \$50,000,000,000 for weapons of destruction. These military and naval expenditures will go up and up as the years go on. We do not dare slacken our program to defend America against Soviet conspiracy. This burden of armaments is a threat to the existence of our economy and our free institutions, as every Member knows.

Yet in the whole Federal budget of about \$70,000,000,000, this appropriation for the USIS represents virtually the only money being spent by us for the promotion of peace. This is almost the only money being spent by us to put the peace principles of the United States before the world. The Voice of America is a positive program; the armaments program is a negative program.

It is my honest opinion that dollar for dollar, we can save more precious lives through the Voice of America than we can by any single expenditure made by this Congress.

No. 3. If you doubt the effectiveness of the Voice of America, please let me call the roll of some of its enemies in the Communist world. These are a few of the rogues and rascals who dislike the voice:

President Götterwald, the miserable traitor who sold the wonderful Republic of Czechoslovakia to the Russian Communists, said this:

"The Voice of America broadcasts . . . distorted facts, spread untruths, intentionally harmed the economic relations of my

country with others, and assisted deserters and common criminals."

If Götterwald doesn't like the voice, it must be good.

Bierut, the puppet President of Poland, said this:

"The radio propaganda of the imperialist, though noisy and mendacious to the point of idiocy, does reach the most backward cells of our organism. This criminal diversion must be stamped out."

And what about the Russian Soviet Government? Well, the Moscow government maintains more than 1,200 transmitters whose basic task is to jam the Voice of America and keep it away from the Russian people. The Kremlin spends as much trying to keep out the Voice of America as we spend on its whole operation.

The opposition of these Communist leaders constitutes the finest testimonials the Voice of America could ever have.

No. 4: The records will show that the 30-year propaganda war waged from Moscow has done more to win converts to communism and to disrupt the free world than Soviet arms.

The library at Yale University has a collection of more than 1,300 items of Communist propaganda printed in Chinese and distributed in China. The Soviets really swamped China with its literature. They had special appeals for the young people, for the women, for the professional people. These propaganda articles struck every note in the artful and skillful Soviet propaganda line.

I believe that intensive study of this literature would disclose that it was the Soviet Government's biggest weapon in China.

Recently, the Soviets held one of their giant youth festivals in Germany. Some members of this Senate were privileged a few days ago to view the official Communist motion picture of the 1950 festival in Germany.

To my mind, there is only one adequate term to describe its effect upon an American mind—terrifying. These youngsters in the Soviet world are taught that they are crusaders in the cause of truth. They are taught to hate the people of the United States as the enemy who wishes to destroy them. They are drilled and schooled and disciplined, physically, mentally, and spiritually like so many robots. Never in my life have I witnessed in such a striking way what can be done by mass propaganda to destroy the truth and to make machines of human individuals.

These youngsters in the Soviet zone are just as sincere in their fear and hatred of us as we are in our hatred of communism.

Are we going to reduce or cripple the Voice of America, the only possible means we have for getting a message of truth to these youngsters behind the curtain? If the Soviets can accomplish so much evil by propaganda, can't we offset it by propaganda of our own?

Mr. Sarnoff, recently returned from Europe, said in his opinion we need a \$500,000,000 appropriation for propaganda purposes. That's how much importance he attaches to this work.

No. 5: The Soviet Union by its false propaganda for 30 years has provided a perfect background for the Voice of America. While the Soviets tell lies, people across the globe now listen to news broadcasts from the United States because they tell the truth.

It was the Voice of America which first told the people of Czechoslovakia that another purge was on its way. When the purge took place, the prestige of the Voice went up enormously.

We know that this Congress passed a resolution of friendship for the Russian people which the Soviet Government ordered printed in virtually every newspaper in Russia. Why?



Because for a solid month the Voice of America taunted the Kremlin leaders, told them they were afraid of the Russian people, and dared them to print the resolution. Finally news of the resolution became so widespread the Kremlin leaders were forced to order its publication. This is the best proof of the effectiveness of our propaganda.

No. 6: In the libraries maintained by our Government in foreign countries we have on hand the finest publications printed in the United States. This is the way to tell the story of America—to show other peoples the publications which we read ourselves, the publications which criticize Truman and Acheson just as freely as they criticize Stalin. The best way to advocate freedom of the press is to practice it. Let people see that we are not afraid of self-criticism.

No. 7: A review committee of outstanding newspapermen, headed by Mr. Canham, of the Christian Science Monitor, has reviewed the Voice of America program and found it good. We have the testimony of businessmen and others that it is doing an excellent job.

No. 8: If we cut down the Voice of America at this critical time, I think it is a confession that we have nothing of importance to tell the world.

If we give up on the Voice of America—if we give up on the program to reach the people behind the iron curtain at this time—then I believe it will be the most serious strategic blunder in the history of American foreign relations.

Senators, we are piling the heaviest armament burden in history on the backs of the American people. We are doing so because we are afraid of the Soviet Union.

We will resolve this difference with Soviet Russia either by propaganda, by reaching the people behind the iron curtain, or we will resolve it by war. If war comes, it will be the most hideous war in history. There will be no winner, as everyone knows.

But we can reach the millions of people behind the iron curtain. We are beginning to reach them now. We can win this battle by the use of words and pictures, by sending words of hope and peace to the imprisoned millions in the Soviet zone, and not by using human bodies as cannon fodder.

I deplore the whispered statement that the Communists are better propagandists than we are. We have a better cause and we have the means to put that cause before the world.

I repeat again, in my judgment, we can save more lives dollar for dollar through the Voice of America than we can by any single activity or agency carried on by this Government.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Arizona is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield me an additional minute?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 1 minute of my time on the amendment to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, ever since I have been a Member of the United States Senate, I have been a member of the communications committee, a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. During our long and continuing study of communications, I have become more

and more convinced of the necessity of greater freedom of exchange of information and ideas throughout the world. Mr. President, we can appropriate billions of dollars for defense, but what good is that if we do not at the same time do something affirmatively to bring about peace in the world. The way to peace is to make it possible for the people of the world to understand one another; to appreciate the good in every group of people; to become tolerant. The Voice of America is the one program we have today which is actively trying to sell America to the world.

I do not for one moment condone criticism of the distinguished Senator from Nevada. If I had my way about it, I would have nothing but praise for the senior Senator from Nevada printed in every magazine in the United States. But these are privately owned and edited publications and under our system of government their editors and writers are at complete liberty to express their own views.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to the fact that even if we appropriate only the \$85,000,000 which it is proposed we now appropriate, the total would still be \$30,000,000 below the budget estimate.

Mr. President, Senators may talk about watching this program for a year. It may well be that we shall have only a year—yes, less than a year—in which to sell peace to the world. We cannot afford to gamble now by silencing the only effective voice we have and take that chance.

Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield me one more minute?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a few days ago I placed in the RECORD a statement by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America, discussing his views on Western Europe today. General Sarnoff is a recognized authority on radio broadcasting. He has, in the past, been critical of the Voice of America. He recognizes its faults, but he also recognizes its virtues, and its vital importance today. He points out the good which the Voice of America is doing in Europe. He has been quoted as urging far larger appropriations than even the President recommended.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am sorry, I do not have time to yield. I have only a half minute.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I repeat, we cannot afford to gamble with the peace of the world in this way. Of course, the Voice of America was not perfect when the program was started. It is not perfect now. Neither is the operation of a radio station perfect when it first opens; but the operation is improved with experience. This is too valuable a weapon in the battle that is now going on for men's minds between Com-

munist totalitarianism and democratic freedom to be hampered by niggardly appropriations.

I contend, Mr. President, that the program is improving, and we cannot improve it more by cutting down the money necessary to carry it out.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I allocate 1 minute to the Senator from California [Mr. Nixon].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, the tragedy of this debate is that the issue we are discussing is not whether we should increase the amount of \$115,000,000 requested for the Voice of America program but how much we should decrease it, whether to \$63,000,000 or to \$85,000,000. I say that the very fact that we are discussing how much we shall decrease the request reflects the lack of confidence on the part of Members of the Senate and of many people in the country in the program of the Voice of America, because certainly no one can question the necessity for such a program and no one can question its effectiveness when it is properly operated.

Let us see what has happened in the 6 years since World War II. In that time the Communists have gained and the free nations of the world have lost—600,000,000 people. The Communists have made this gain without losing a single Russian soldier in combat. They did it through the use of various methods: A revolution in China, a coup d'état in Czechoslovakia, a rigged election in Poland. But there is one common element in all of their victories. They first won to their cause a dedicated group of Czechoslovakians, of Chinese or of Poles as the case might be and these native Communist groups proceeded to do the rest.

To win these groups, and thereby to make these great gains, they had to have effective propaganda and this establishes beyond any question the necessity for an effective program of counterpropaganda, but it also reflects the fact that the program we have had in the past 6 years has not been effective.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. President, that in supporting the increase from \$63,000,000 to \$85,000,000, I am not casting a vote which should in any way be considered a blanket endorsement of the program which has been carried on in the past. I think the program has improved considerably in the past 2 years but it needs much more improvement. I believe that the need for an effective propaganda program abroad is so great that \$85,000,000 is the very minimum we should appropriate for it, and I hope that those in charge of the program will give the American people their money's worth and more.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think I have a minute and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I say that I want to associate myself completely with the statement just made by the Senator from California. I believe



the whole overseas information program has made mistakes. Maybe it has made more mistakes than it should normally make, but it seems to me that the goal of carrying on propaganda against communism overseas is more important than any mistakes it makes, and that we should look to the opportunities and the potentialities made available by this appropriation.

I commend the committee for what it has done. I think that of the \$22,000,000 we have been talking about, the \$1,000 for the Reporter may well be money which could be better spent for some other magazine or purpose. The State Department has now ordered, under Mr. Barrett, the establishment of a commission of American newspaper and magazine people to check through the whole list of publications to determine what they consider to be typical American publications. I am quite sure they will screen out the Reporter. But I believe that once we have accepted a magazine and subscribed to it, we should not exercise Government censorship, as Hitler did, by clipping out criticisms of every single member of the Government who might be adversely mentioned.

I have in my hand a copy of Harper's magazine which carries a complimentary article about the senior Senator from Nevada. It was sent to over a hundred information offices by the same Department of State that sent out the Reporter.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I have a very short time in which to yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator believe that the article with reference to the Senator from Nevada should have been sent out at taxpayers' expense?

Mr. MUNDT. I believe the magazine should be sent out at the taxpayers' expense as part of our information program. I do not believe the Government should censor the contents of responsible publications.

The Saturday Evening Post for April 28, 1951, went to 169 overseas information offices and contained an article by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] on the subject Why Should Not the Spanish Fight for Us? and giving the State Department "unshirted hates." I do not think we should have a censorship by the State Department which would protect the Senator or me or the Department itself from any particular criticism. I am sure if we are to be criticized we would much rather be criticized in Calcutta than in Las Vegas, Nev., or Rapid City, S. Dak. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "\$63,000,000", and insert in lieu thereof "\$85,000,000."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask that I be notified after I have spoken for 5 minutes, and then I shall reserve the remainder of my time.

I hope that in the time we have remaining we can get down to a genuine

discussion of the whole program of overseas information.

The new commission being established by the State Department is a proper commission to determine what are legitimate American publications. The subcommittee very wisely made available all the money the budget requested for the radio program. Hence we have no need to discuss further the matter of periodicals and of radio programs. I think we can confidently expect improvement in both areas of activity.

We must now determine whether we shall continue in any substantial degree the exchange-of-personnel programs which has been highly successful in bringing to this country members of the Japanese Diet, members of boards of trade, clergymen, journalists, school teachers, and school children from abroad to look at America. If, after having looked at us, they do not like us, we have no complaint. But I am sure that 90 percent of them will be favorably impressed.

It is a question of whether we are going to operate our information offices overseas as if they were at the end of a yo-yo string, opening up offices this year and closing them down next year. That is one reason why we do not get good personnel. I think we should stabilize the program at some level, for instance, at the \$85,000,000 level provided for in my amendment. They have been operating on about \$7,000,000 a month for the past year. The House cut \$30,000,000 from what had been requested. When we have already spent \$100,000,000 overseas, it is not asking very much to request \$85,000,000 to try to tell the world that we have not an inexhaustible supply of dollars, that we want them to join us in a crusade for freedom, and try to bring to them an understanding that we are opposing communism and that we are sending this money over in the interest of peace. This is the only device and program we have to carry the message of America outside the boundaries of America on either side of the iron curtain.

Can anyone imagine General Motors spending \$10,000,000 to bring out a new model and then suggesting that Chrysler advertise it, publicize it, and describe it? But if we spend \$100,000,000 overseas and then leave it to the Soviets to tell the world why we are spending it, we can understand why we will not be making better headway and winning support overseas. So I say that increasing that amount to \$85,000,000 is a happy compromise between the \$115,000,000 the State Department says it needs, and the \$63,000,000 that the subcommittee, in its wisdom, made available.

Mr. President, the programs in question are realistic. Part of the additional \$22,000,000 is going to go for making available additional pamphlets and publications, such as this which is entitled "Korea, My Home," a remarkably fine job of cartoons, published in the languages of Asia to carry the message on what communism means to Asia and the people of the Orient.

Another remarkably fine publication is entitled "I Have Lost My Land," which

is prepared in America but circulated in every single country in which we operate. It is the story of what freedom means to every human being. It is published under the imprimatur of a local organization, so we appear to the people of a foreign country to be talking to them through their own service organizations. What better propaganda can we have? Let us not curtail a program that is operating so well for America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator did not take one of the copies of The Reporter home with him, did he?

Mr. MUNDT. No. I found a copy, but I burned it up. I did not like it any better than the Senator from Nevada did.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from South Dakota was boasting of cartoons. I thought the Senator might like to see a very interesting cartoon published in the Reporter. It is a representation of our colleague, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. MUNDT. I hope the Senator does not show it to the Senator from Tennessee. I am hoping he will vote for my amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think he ought to see it.

Mr. President, the proposition has been made in some quarters that the function of the information and education program is to make available to peoples overseas all facets of opinion in this country, regardless of whether or not they are slanted, or regardless of whether they contribute to or hinder the main objective of the information and education program, namely, to combat communism on a world-wide basis. It appears to me, Mr. President, that the distributing of a magazine containing scurrilous attacks on the Congress will not be of any assistance in achieving the expressed main objective of this program.

Mr. President, with that thought in mind I want to call to the attention of the Senate that the \$63,000,000 recommended for this program will allow necessary things to be done but will serve, I hope, to prevent frivolous and ill-conceived projects to go forward. In addition, the amount allowed will force a reduction in the excessively high administrative and policy planning overhead of this agency.

Let me say right there, that is one of the things the Appropriations Committee looked at with great care.

I say, excessively high, advisedly, because in 1951 out of a total of seventy-million-and-some-odd dollars this agency spent over \$12,000,000 for administrative and policy-planning purposes, or almost 20 percent. Their 1952 budget request of \$115,000,000 contains over \$19,000,000 for this purpose. Let me repeat that. In 1952 their budget request of \$115,000,000 contains an item of more than \$19,000,000 for this purpose.

The argument, of course, can be made that some policy planning is necessary, but the committee has direct evidence that policy is established and promul-



gated by the regular bureaus and sections of the Department of State, and that such policy groups as this agency has are duplications and therefore cause a waste of funds.

Mr. President, neither I nor any other members of the Appropriations Committee wishes to curtail the effectiveness of this program. However, there are some of us who believe that a great amount of money is being wasted and that just as effective a program can be had without this waste.

Mr. President, there is nothing magic in the House figure. The House cut the program by \$30,000,000 and this represents only its judgment. It is our judgment that \$7,000,000 under their 1951 appropriation will be sufficient, and that is what we have allowed. We feel that this \$7,000,000 reduction can be absorbed in a reduction of administrative and policy-planning overhead and in the abolition of frivolous and unwarranted projects that have grown up since this program was started.

Mr. President, I wish again to emphasize the fact that dwelling on the Voice of America the argument runs that we must penetrate the iron curtain, but that we can penetrate it only by the use of radio; that we have provided facilities to penetrate it by that method. Mr. President, all that the Bureau of the Budget said they should have the committee has given them for that purpose. We have not curtailed the amount by one single dollar. So we come before this body asking that there be a review, a study made by that agency which has been created, to see that their administrative expenses may be cut down.

Mr. President, of all the money expended by the Bureau of Public Roads of the United States, its administrative expenditures are held down to 3 percent. Yet we see the volume of expense in connection with this program. It seemed to the Committee on Appropriations that here is a place where we could save a dollar or so for the taxpayers, because we know that there is a tax bill coming along which is going to wring the hearts of some people in America. We know that sixty-odd-billion dollars are going to be necessary. We thought that somewhere along the line where the administrative expense was high, and where it would do no harm to the program, we could curtail and save a few dollars to the taxpayers of America.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate very much longer. So far as I am concerned, I regret very deeply that I find myself separated from my two colleagues the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] on legislation. I am always happier and feel on much more solid ground when I am associated with them. I recall spending 30 hours in continuous session at one time, battling shoulder to shoulder with them on the Security Act which we jointly sponsored.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator that we are always glad to have him with us. We regret exceedingly

that some ill wind blew this time to take him from us.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I think this whole discussion, and the critical analysis by the subcommittee, have been useful and constructive. I think it is important to bring to bear upon this section of the State Department a critical analysis, as I have tried to do individually for a long period of time.

I am highly gratified that these points have been made, and that certain mistakes have been highlighted—such things as distributing an inferior grade of magazine and as broadcasting careless statements on the radio.

I went to the trouble of having the easel set up here in the front of the Senate so that I might display certain posters and point out some things which the average Member of the Senate may not realize unless he follows this program carefully.

What is being done under the United States information program? These are typical pamphlets or posters of the kind which are going to be prepared if we can add the \$22,000,000 which is suggested by the amendment sponsored by other Senators and myself. These posters and pamphlets are printed in foreign languages, with cartoons of the kind acceptable to the particular area, telling the story of freedom and pointing out the evils of communism.

That is not done under the label of the State Department, but with our financial assistance it is done through sponsoring organizations within the countries affected, which are acceptable and reputable from the standpoint of the people—veterans' organizations, church groups, fraternal groups, and patriotic groups.

I appeal to Senators to look at this program from the standpoint of reason. I think this is smart anti-Communist propaganda. I deny that the Communists in our country have been doing anything any wiser or smarter than this. I think we are improving and moving in the right direction. I want to encourage the program, and not to discourage it. It is proving its effectiveness.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. Would not the Senator agree that what is involved here on a great scale is a vast political campaign all over the world, in effect?

Mr. MUNDT. Exactly.

Mr. NIXON. We all know from our own experience that in a political campaign we cannot safely rely on any one medium for the purpose of convincing the voters of the wisdom and effectiveness of our own views. I think the Senator has illustrated, through his remarks, that a diversified campaign is being developed by the Voice of America. We trust that it will continue to follow along these lines, using all media available for the purpose of reaching the different people whom we must reach in order to win.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree; and I think the analogy of a political campaign is very apropos. This is a job of influencing the

minds of men and women throughout the world.

The placard which I now hold before me has an appropriate title.

This is a different kind of appeal, which is being sent out in areas where almost every shop window, every telephone pole, and every barn is plastered with Communist propaganda. This is not the type of thing which we ordinarily expect America to do, but we are trying to stop a war. With material of this type we are fighting fire with fire.

Here is an anti-Communist propaganda cartoon or poster of the same type which the Communists are using.

This poster shows the Red monster of communism. It is a poster used in Thailand. It is produced in Manila. It is published without any attribution; 250,000 copies have been distributed in one country alone in an effort to counteract what the Communists have done to the extent of many hundreds of thousands more.

We have many more pamphlets and folders of the same kind. Here is a story entitled "When the Communists Came." This poster shows a typical family in a land which has been invaded by Communists. It has been translated into all the languages of the Orient. Pictures have been used, as well as cartoons and photographs. It tells a very vivid story about the failures and vices of communism. It is hard-hitting, realistic material.

If we are out to win the war of words and minds, what more can we do than to add this material to the broadcasts, the international missions, and the other facets of our overseas information program?

The next poster is entitled "We Are No Longer Human Beings." This is distributed by the Catholic Youth Organization of the Philippines. It contains a facsimile of a letter from a nun in Russia—a tear-jerking portrayal of what happens to members of the Catholic religion in a country like Russia once it has been taken over by the Communists.

Here is a folder which is being used in the Philippines, where the Communists are making desperate efforts to make inroads. This poster shows the Communists stabbing the dove of peace. It is an effective, impressive, memorable, and persuasive pictorial presentation.

This is not the kind of poster which we put out in our American political campaigns, because it does not appeal to our people. But this is the kind of propaganda, the kind of poster, the kind of publicity which appeals to the people to whom it is directed. The Communists are using it. If we deny this appropriation it means that we stand mute; we have no answer to the Communist attacks. The passerby sees only the Communist poster, and does not have an opportunity to see the answer.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator say that that poster would appeal to the people in a Communist country? Does the Senator think it would stand up very long on a post in a Communist country?



Mr. MUNDT. It is not put up in Communist countries. It is put up on this side of the iron curtain—for example, in the Philippines—to help keep that country from becoming Communist. We have no way of distributing posters in Communist countries.

Such posters as these, prepared by Americans with American taxpayers' money and devised by Americans, make this type of thing available, however, in the many areas of the world which we are trying to help stay out of the clutches of communism.

It may be said that the State Department is soft; perhaps it is. There are many people down there in whom I do not have confidence. I should like to start at the top and remove some of them. I think it should be staffed in large part with abler, sturdier Americans. But that does not make me believe that we should curtail the Voice of America. This is the only overseas campaign we have to keep this country out of war; most of our other overseas programs are designed to help win a war if we get into it. How are we going to reach the minds of men and the hearts and souls of individuals unless we use the best communication means at our command?

Unless we are convinced that war is inevitable, this overseas information program is the only device available today to try to reach the minds of men to avert war, but conversion, conviction, and persuasion.

Here are other pamphlets of a similar type. This sort of material is being distributed all over the world. Should we keep it at home to save \$22,000,000? At a time when we are spending, and are going to be asked in a week or two to spend, many billions of dollars more for all kinds of activities abroad, at a time when we are sending hundreds of thousands of American boys abroad, are we going to deny them the protection which comes from a friendly environment, and from a climate where the people understand why they are there, and why the money is being spent and what their respective responsibilities are to help?

I concur in the noble ambition of the great Senator from Nevada. We must start saving money. I agree that we can save some money in the State Department. It is going to be very easy to slash \$22,000,000 additional from the multibillion spending program directed to the effort of putting more guns on more shoulders or more food in the stomachs of more men. I believe that in the process we had better start working more energetically and effectively on the minds of men.

I believe that the reason the Communists have been able to keep under subjection 800,000,000 human beings around the world is that they have not overlooked the effectiveness of pamphlets, posters, motion pictures, propaganda, and everything available which can legitimately or illegitimately be done.

Let us do all we can legitimately. Let us not reduce this appropriation and take a chance. No one knows what next year is going to bring. If things go from bad to worse, let it never be said that the United States Senate closed

some of the great avenues approaching the goal of peace, because we saved \$22,000,000 too much from an appropriation bill dedicated to the purpose of averting war and winning friends for freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the committee amendment on page 15, line 22.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McMAHON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, are we about to vote on an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is about to vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the committee amendment on page 15, line 22.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senate is about to vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] to the committee amendment on page 15, line 22?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McMAHON. A "yea" vote is a vote in favor of \$85,000,000? A "nay" vote is a vote in favor of \$63,000,000?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Do I understand that a "nay" vote is a vote in favor of \$64,000,000?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A "nay" vote is a vote in favor of \$63,000,000. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORDON. On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is absent because of a death in his family. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr.

ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 16, as follows:

#### YEAS—52

|             |           |              |
|-------------|-----------|--------------|
| Alken       | Duff      | Hendrickson  |
| Benton      | Ellender  | Hennings     |
| Butler, Md. | Frear     | Hickenlooper |
| Case        | Fulbright | Hill         |
| Clements    | Gillette  | Hoey         |
| Connally    | Green     | Holland      |
| Douglas     | Hayden    | Humphrey     |



|               |           |              |
|---------------|-----------|--------------|
| Ives          | McFarland | Saltonstall  |
| Johnson, Tex. | McMahon   | Smathers     |
| Kefauver      | Moody     | Smith, Maine |
| Kerr          | Morse     | Sparkman     |
| Kilgore       | Mundt     | Stennis      |
| Knowland      | Murray    | Thye         |
| Langer        | Neely     | Underwood    |
| Lehman        | Nixon     | Watkins      |
| Lodge         | Pastore   | Young        |
| Long          | Robertson |              |
| Magnuson      | Russell   |              |

## NAYS—16

|                |           |           |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|
| Carlson        | Kem       | Schoeppel |
| Dirksen        | Malone    | Welker    |
| Dworshak       | McCarran  | Wherry    |
| Ferguson       | McClellan | Williams  |
| Hunt           | McKellar  |           |
| Johnson, Colo. | Millikin  |           |

## NOT VOTING—28

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Anderson      | Cordon          | Monroney     |
| Bennett       | Eastland        | O'Connor     |
| Brewster      | Ecton           | O'Mahoney    |
| Bricker       | Flanders        | Smith, N. J. |
| Bridges       | George          | Smith, N. C. |
| Butler, Nebr. | Jenner          | Taft         |
| Byrd          | Johnston, S. C. | Tobey        |
| Cain          | Martin          | Wiley        |
| Capehart      | Maybank         |              |
| Chavez        | McCarthy        |              |

So Mr. MUNDT's amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question recurs on the adoption of the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

## ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate that the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee have just finished their consideration of, and will shortly report to the Senate, the bill known as the Mutual Security Act of 1951, commonly known as the foreign aid bill.

## ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING CONSIDERATION OF BILL TERMINATING ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement. There is on the calendar House bill 4550, a bill providing for the termination of assistance to foreign countries exporting war materials to Russia and her satellites. That bill is commonly known as the Battle bill.

I had discussed informally with Members the advisability of taking up that bill in the Senate tomorrow. The Battle bill is closely involved with the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, mentioned by the Senator from Texas, and properly should be considered prior to that bill. Therefore on Monday, at the beginning of the session, I shall move that the Senate consider that bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—  
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator may proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply regret the announcement which has been made by the majority leader.

The so-called Battle bill has no place on the agenda for consideration by the Senate on Monday. The consideration of that bill should follow the considera-

tion of the mutual security bill, because the bill to which the Senator from Arizona refers has to do with what is provided in the mutual security bill, if that bill is passed.

There has not been a hearing on the Battle bill. It has been reported from the committee without a hearing.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] will move to recommit the bill. The bill has not had the proper study. We do not know what is in it.

I say to the distinguished Members of the Senate that I think the bill should be recommitted and a study should be made of it before the bill is brought up for consideration on the floor of the Senate.

I am not in any way trying to hold back or to refuse to cooperate. Certainly the record will show that the minority leader has cooperated in every way with the majority in expediting the program. However, I feel that this bill is one which should not be debated on the floor of the Senate prior to the time when the mutual security bill is considered and prior to the consideration by the Senate of other important proposed legislation which has been discussed for 6 weeks, in connection with the agenda, as "must" legislation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], has cooperated, and I appreciate very deeply his cooperation. It has been as a result of his cooperation that we have made progress on the legislative calendar.

The Battle bill will have to be disposed of one way or another. It is part and parcel of a "must" bill, even though before us as a separate measure. So we shall just have to battle it out, and it might as well be battled out at one time as at another. The joint committees have announced that the Mutual Security Act would not be ready for Senate consideration on Monday, and in my judgment we will save valuable time by disposing of the Battle bill first.

If we are going to make the deadline we must move ahead. The Battle bill must be disposed of. Either it or the so-called Kem amendment will be before us as an amendment to the Mutual Security Act; and we might as well get the issue settled promptly.

I regret that my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska, does not agree with me in this instance, although I am pleased that on most occasions he is a very agreeable person indeed.

However, as I say, inasmuch as it is the Battle bill, we shall just have to "battle" it out.

## STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I now submit an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, in line 23, before the colon, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "and of which \$10,000,000 shall be available for the exchange of persons."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Such an amendment can be considered only by unanimous consent, because the committee amendment has already been agreed to, and is not subject to amendment except by unanimous consent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. Inasmuch as this amendment is submitted for inclusion following the point where the committee amendment was adopted, is it not now in order to amend the bill at that point?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's amendment is to the committee amendment which already has been agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. The amendment is not intended to be; it is intended to come at the end of the line in which the committee amendment which has been agreed to appears.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendment is to the bill itself, the amendment would not be in order at this time, and would not be in order until all committee amendments are disposed of.

If the amendment is offered to the committee amendment, the amendment would not be in order, because the committee amendment has already been adopted.

Mr. MUNDT. The amendment is to the bill itself. So it would have to be offered after the committee amendments are disposed of; is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Any amendments to be offered to the text of the bill will have to be offered after the committee amendments are disposed of.

Mr. MUNDT. Then I withdraw the amendment at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is not passing now on whether the amendment is to the committee amendment or to the text of the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the Chair pass on that point now?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment would not be in order at this time either as an amendment to the committee amendment or as an amendment to the text of the bill, unless the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to is reconsidered, so that an amendment could be offered to that committee amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. That is because there are other committee amendments pending, is it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment was just agreed to?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I object.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have no desire to have the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to reconsidered. This amendment is a perfecting amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course, a perfecting amendment must be offered



before the committee amendment has been agreed to. After it has been agreed to, it cannot be changed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT The Senator will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. After a committee amendment has been adopted, surely there is nothing to prevent a Senator from offering an amendment following it, to become a part of the bill itself, is there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendment is offered to the text of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, the amendment would be in order after all the committee amendments are disposed of.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Chair; that is what I wished to know.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 20, line 5, after the figures "\$2,250,000", to insert "of which not to exceed \$2,145,690 shall be available for personal services."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. McCARRAN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee desire to be recognized?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,250,000" and insert "\$2,320,600."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that that is an amendment to the text of the bill, and has no relationship to the committee amendment. If that is true, the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is not in order at this time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I merely wanted to be sure that, when it is in order, I would have an opportunity of offering it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Tennessee when the proper time arrives. But an amendment which perfects the bill is not now in order.

Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, is the amendment now in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not now; not until all the committee amendments are disposed of. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 20, line 13, to change the period to a semicolon, and to insert "\$9,032,000, of which not to exceed \$7,774,150 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 20, in line 17, after the numeral "\$3,200,000", insert "of which not to exceed \$3,035,932 shall be available for personal services and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, at the top of page 38, to insert:

Transport aircraft development: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 867), relating to the development of improved transport aircraft including hire of aircraft; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem; \$597,500, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$22,500 shall be available for personal services.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to oppose the committee amendment. This is an appropriation for transport aircraft development. The amendment is on page 38 of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Illinois let the Chair straighten out the question of time? Under the unanimous-consent agreement, each side is entitled to 20 minutes on the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I move to strike the language on page 38, from lines 1 to 9, inclusive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not in order. That is a committee amendment, and the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. A motion to strike the committee amendment is not in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly the one opposing the committee amendment should have 20 minutes, should he not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I only need 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was about to say that, when he was interrupted.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois, if he opposes the amendment, would be entitled to 20 minutes in his own time, and the Senator from Nevada would be entitled to 20 minutes in support of the amendment—or the Senator from Nebraska, in the event the Senator from Nevada opposes it. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall not take more than 2 minutes. I should like to read from the House report on this bill. The House turned down the request for \$600,000, and said:

It was testified that this testing—

That is, the transport aircraft development—

would contribute very little to national defense, but would be primarily for the benefit of the commercial air lines. This type of aircraft development should be carried on and financed by the plane manufacturers and the commercial air lines rather than the Federal Government.

Mr. President, the air lines are now out of the red. They are making money, now, and they are making, according to the financial reports which I read in the papers, very considerable sums of money. The aircraft manufacturers are also making money with the large war orders which are being placed with them. Why should we take on this

job of testing transport aircraft? Why should not this expense be borne by the private interests which are already having a large volume of business and making money? Here is a chance to save \$600,000 and remove a virtual subsidy to an industry which does not need it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the chairman yield 2 minutes to me to support the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; I will yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, in the case of a committee amendment, the Chair is of the opinion that the time should be divided between the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Therefore, the Chair would have to assume that the Senator from Illinois was speaking in the time of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce handled the authorization bill for this appropriation, and we are quite familiar with it. I think there is some misunderstanding of the purpose of this appropriation. The United States has fallen far behind the other nations of the world in the matter of use of jet airplanes for commercial purposes. I do not think it is at all the part of wisdom for the United States to drop behind all other nations. I notice that we have only two very small jet-propelled aircraft built for commercial purposes. They are still undergoing experimentation in the United States, while England has nine very successful jet commercial airplanes; France has one, and Canada, our neighbor to the north, has two.

The purpose of this appropriation is to enable the Civil Aeronautics Authority to test any commercial jet plane which might be offered to the American air traveling public to use the air or to use the facilities of jet propelled air commerce in the United States; and it seems to me that, as a protection to life, limb, and property, the United States ought to inspect these airplanes to find out whether they are safe for flight. That is the purpose of this legislation. It is not a matter of subsidizing the airlines. The money is not to build jet planes; it is to test them to see if they are safe for public use. The airlines are using the conventional type of airplanes—the tried and true plane of today. They do not have to convert to the jet plane, unless and until foreign powers bring a commercial plane into the field, which makes it desirable on the part of the American people who wish to travel by air, to fly by jet planes. We are thinking in terms of tomorrow when much commercial flying will be done by the jets.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a question?



Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not have much time, but I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there not a branch of the armed services which carries on experimental work with jet transport planes? It seems to me hardly believable that they are not doing such important work as this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The military has hundreds of millions of dollars for experimentation in this field; but this is a commercial plane we are discussing. The military cannot be expected to inspect a plane which might be offered to the American traveling public.

Congress has placed upon the Civil Aeronautics Authority the responsibility of inspection. They have a very great responsibility. Are we going to expect them to do it? Are we going to expect them to see that these planes which may be offered to the traveling public of the United States are safe or unsafe?

Mr. AIKEN. I should not object to appropriating money to inspect the planes, but in the development of the Air Transport Service aircraft it would seem to me that the armed services must have done such work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Congress is handling hundreds of millions of dollars to the military for this type of plane but not commercial planes; for military planes.

Mr. AIKEN. The planes of the Air Transport Command must be commercial planes, or planes that are adaptable.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; they are nothing of the kind. Air Transport Command planes are not commercial planes. They do not transport airborne passengers at all. It is a question of whether this Congress wants to protect the flying public of the United States who pay for their travel by seeing to it that they travel on safe planes. It is not a

matter of economy—it is a matter of recklessness—to strike an appropriation of this kind from the bill. It is out-and-out recklessness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Colorado has expired.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield the Senator from Colorado one more minute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A great many nations receiving assistance from the United States are getting far ahead of the United States in the construction and operation of jet-propelled commercial planes. In fact, we have but two unsatisfactory commercial planes of this type.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement of the planes owned by the nations to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Jet transports that have flown*

(As presented in paper by R. Dixon Speas before Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences, June 27-28, 1951)

| Country         | Aircraft                    | Power plant                | Number | Type <sup>1</sup> | Take-off thrust or horsepower     | Take-off weight | Landing weight | Empty operating weight <sup>2</sup> | Span          | Length       | Height       | Wing area     | Aspect ratio | Cruising altitude | True air speed    |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| United States.. | Chase XC-123A.              | General Electric J-47.     | 4      | TJ.....           | 5,200 pounds...                   | Pounds (3)      | Pounds (3)     | Pounds (3)                          | Ft. in. 110 0 | Ft. in. 77 1 | Ft. in. 32 8 | Sq. ft. 1,223 | 9.89         | Ft. (3)           | Miles per hr. (3) |
| Do.....         | Convair Turbo-liner.        | Allison, T-38.....         | 2      | TP.....           | 2,750 horsepower.                 | 45,000          | 42,875         | 28,000                              | 91 9          | 74 8         | 26 11        | 817           | 10.0         | 25,000            | 350               |
| Canada.....     | AVRO Jetliner I.            | Rolls Royce Derwent.       | 4      | TJ.....           | 3,700 pounds...                   | 65,000          | 55,000         | 40,000                              | 98 1          | 82 9         | 27 2         | 1,157         | 8.31         | 30,000            | 425               |
| Do.....         | AVRO Jetliner II.           | Allison J-33.....          | 4      | TJ (WI)...        | 5,400 pounds...                   | 80,000          | 65,000         | 41,000                              | 98 1          | 84 5         | 27 2         | 1,157         | 8.31         | 35,000            | 460               |
| France.....     | Sud-Quest 30.               | Rolls Royce Nene.          | 2      | TJ.....           | 5,000 pounds...                   | 37,500          | (3)            | (3)                                 | 84 7          | 61 0         | (3)          | (3)           | (3)          | 33,000            | 465               |
| England.....    | Armstrong Whitworth Apollo. | Armstrong Siddeley, Mamba. | 4      | TJ.....           | 1,320 horsepower plus 405 pounds. | 45,000          | 43,000         | 28,500                              | 92 0          | 71 6         | 26 0         | 986           | 8.58         | 20,000            | 275               |
| Do.....         | AVRO Ashton.                | Rolls Royce, Nene.         | 4      | TJ.....           | 5,000 pounds...                   | 80,000          | (3)            | 42,000                              | 120 0         | 85 3         | 20 11        | 1,420         | (3)          | -----             | -----             |
| Do.....         | DeHavilland Comet I.        | DeHavilland Ghost.         | 4      | TJ.....           | -----do-----                      | 105,000         | 80,000         | (3)                                 | 115 0         | 93 0         | 28 5         | 2,015         | (3)          | 40,000            | 490               |
| Do.....         | DeHavilland Comet II.       | Rolls Royce, Avon.         | 4      | TP.....           | 6,000 pounds plus.                | (3)             | (3)            | (3)                                 | 115 0         | 93 0         | 28 5         | 2,015         | (3)          | -----             | -----             |
| Do.....         | Handley-Page Hermes-5.      | Bristol, Theseus...        | 4      | TP.....           | 2,820 horsepower.                 | 90,000          | 75,000         | 54,000                              | 113 0         | 96 10        | 29 11        | 1,408         | 9.08         | 20,000            | 350               |
| Do.....         | Handley-Page Marathon-2.    | Armstrong Siddeley, Mamba. | 2      | TP.....           | 1,320 horsepower plus 405 pounds. | 18,000          | 18,000         | 11,000                              | 65 0          | 52 1         | 14 1         | 498           | (3)          | 5-20,000          | 250               |
| Do.....         | Vickers Viscount.           | Rolls Royce, Dart.         | 4      | TP.....           | 1,420 horsepower plus 295 pounds. | 52,500          | 49,800         | 33,200                              | 94 0          | 81 2         | 26 9         | 963           | 9.17         | 20,000            | 275               |
| Do.....         | Vickers 618.....            | Rolls Royce, Nene.         | 2      | TJ.....           | 5,000 pounds...                   | 33,500          | 32,500         | 22,000                              | 89 3          | 65 2         | 19 6         | 882           | 9.0          | -----             | -----             |
| Do.....         | Vickers 663.....            | Rolls Royce Tay..          | 2      | 2TJ.....          | 6,000 pounds plus.                | (3)             | (3)            | (3)                                 | 89 0          | 74 6         | 26 3         | (3)           | (3)          | -----             | -----             |

<sup>1</sup> TJ=turbojet; TP=turboprop; WI=water injection.

<sup>2</sup> Includes everything except fuel and payload.

<sup>3</sup> Not available.

<sup>4</sup> Maximum.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the statement of the Senator from Colorado. I happen to have some personal knowledge of the fact that particularly in England the work is being done by government aid, outright payment of money. We are very far behind in jet-propelled pas-

senger planes. The purpose is to allow the Civil Aeronautics Authority to test planes and make research and build so-called prototype planes which will aid a great deal in our air transportation. I hope this appropriation will not be eliminated.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. For what length of time?

Mr. CASE. I shall take only a minute.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I do not need 5 minutes. If I may have 1 minute it will be sufficient.

I should like to ask some Senator what the difference is between the purpose of this appropriation and that provided on page 35, which reads as follows:

Technical development and evaluation: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), relative to such developmental work and service testing as tends to the creation of improved air-navigation facilities, including landing areas, aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers,



appliances, personnel, and operation methods.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I may answer the Senator by saying that the program to which he is now referring, which appears on page 35 of the bill, is a program which has been provided for for many years. It is in operation at Langley Field and also in California.

According to the justification as it appears on page 228 of the side-slips, the appropriation was submitted as the first step in carrying out the provisions of Public Law 867, Eighty-first Congress, which authorized an appropriation of \$12,500,000 over a 5-year period which will be used for the development of engines, frames, rotors, instruments, accessories, and particularly turbine-jet-powered aircraft. It is considered essential that funds be provided for this purpose if the United States is to regain its position as a leader in the field of aircraft production.

It was also testified that we are far behind today because Great Britain has made vast strides in advancement of this particular subject. Therefore, we thought this item should go into the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Colorado will remember that last year I objected to the passage on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar of a certain bill, and then later withdrew my objection because I was convinced that the bill was sound. Is this appropriation related to that bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. It is an appropriation in part for carrying out the authorization for which Congress voted at the very time to which the Senator from New York refers, and we passed that authorization by unanimous vote with the aid of the able Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that because of the unanimous-consent agreement time is being designated as in my charge. That is only to facilitate the agreement. I want the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to know that I am going to support the committee amendment, and if he wants any further time I should be glad to have him handle the time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the generosity of the Senator, but I think I have made my point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the passed-over committee amendment on page 38.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 38, line 20, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$3,550,000" and insert "\$3,700,000, of which not to exceed \$3,354,000 shall be available for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 43, line 10, after the word "expended", to insert "including not to exceed \$8,563,500 for personal services."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 44, after line 19, to insert:

Public lands highways: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the act of September 7, 1950, \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 46, line 2, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$3,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we are appropriating a rather large amount for various types of highways in forests and on public lands, highways in the form of access roads, and so forth. I understand that in some of the western forests access roads are needed in order that the small lumbermen may get at the stands of timber and not have to bear the expense themselves. But the committee has raised the House figure by \$2,000,000, and has come up to the full budget figure. I think there is a very real question as to how far we should commit ourselves on all these types of direct national roads.

Therefore, wishing to be dogmatic, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee who is steering the bill through the Senate whether he would not like to recede from the committee figure of \$3,000,000 and go back to the House figure of \$1,000,000. I throw myself as a suppliant upon his mercy, and I am sure his kindly eye will look with favor upon the taxpayers.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the justification for this action in raising from \$1,000,000 to \$3,000,000 the amount for this purpose is best expressed in the following language in the justification:

The access road program is totally a defense program of an emergency character. Each access road project must be certified to the Secretary of Commerce by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Interior as important to the national defense before it is approved for construction. General Heileman, in letter to the Commissioner of Public Roads dated July 12, 1951, stated in part.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I to understand then that the eminent chairman of the subcommittee turns a deaf ear to my piteous plea?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have to turn an ear and an eye to my adviser from whom I have just quoted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. With respect to the appropriation heretofore made for access roads, the largest single allocation was made for access roads to the new atomic energy plant in the Savannah, Ga., area.

Mr. McCARRAN. I believe the Senator from South Dakota is correct in his statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 46, line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 63, after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 602. None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to pay an assess-

ment to any international organization which exceeds one-third of the total annual cost thereof.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 602. No representative of the United States Government in any international organization hereafter shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33 1/3 percent of the budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States in excess of 33 1/3 percent of the budget, a commitment requiring a United States appropriation of a larger proportion may be made after consultation by United States representatives in the organization or other appropriate officials of the Department of State with the Committees on Appropriation of the Senate and House of Representatives: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the Inter-American organizations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "8-22-51-C."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "\$675,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a move to decrease the appropriation for the so-called representation allowances from \$675,000 to \$500,000, or a saving of \$175,000. As I understand it, the term "representation allowances" is a euphemism which is intended to disguise the real purpose of the appropriation. No one looking at the term "representation allowances" would know what it means. But it means, as I understand, entertainment to be offered by the State Department to visitors, and that such entertainment is to be primarily liquid in character.

Mr. President, I do not wish to sail under false colors. I am not a teetotaler. But I do not think that it is necessary for us to float foreign relations in a sea of cocktails or champagne. I think that the members of the Foreign Service have got themselves too much into the idea that they have to conduct negotiations with the aura of alcohol about them.

Mr. President, there was once a President of the United States by the name of Rutherford B. Hayes who served fruit punch at the White House. I believe he was not reelected. Whether there was any connection between his serving fruit punch and his failure to get a renomination from the Grand Old Party is a matter of conjecture.

Mr. President, I am not asking that the State Department limit itself to fruit punch, but I am asking that it observe some restraint in the amount of alcohol and the pâté de foie gras which it serves foreign diplomats. In short, there is still room for simple living. I hope we can save \$175,000 by the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. President, I again address the distinguished chairman of the subcommit-



tee. I see his eyes shining with humanity, and I throw myself on his mercy. I know that he will want to enable the State Department and its guests to lead a more simple life. So I hope very much that he will consent to this reduction of \$175,000 in the so-called representation allowances, which is primarily the provision for "booze."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not think I should indulge in the kind of levity indulged in by the Senator from Illinois. I know it was levity. It seems to me that in history it is recorded that a certain committee visited President Lincoln on one occasion during the Civil War and said that he should discharge Grant because he drank too much whisky. Lincoln said to the committee, "Tell me what brand he uses and I will send a barrel to each of my other generals."

Mr. President, I think all of this is not appropriate, really, because the item is not an alcoholic provision. The fact of the matter is that the recommendation for this item is the same as was allowed on the House floor, \$675,000. It is the same amount that the Department received in 1951. This money is used for entertainment purposes.

The Department insists that each officer of the Foreign Service must carry out his obligation to maintain the prestige of the Government of the United States in observing the customs and traditions of entertainment at his post, in entertaining foreigners to develop the necessary relationships which enable him to secure information desired by the United States Government and private industry, and in the presentation of prominent Americans to the government and business officials of the country to which he is assigned. This is his job and it must be done successfully if United States interests are to be served effectively.

Last year this meant that on the average every officer of the Foreign Service was out-of-pocket \$250. The proposed amendment would increase this to \$363. Such action strengthens the argument that able Americans should avoid employment in the Foreign Service unless they are men of independent means.

Hence, however my heart swells for the effort of the able Senator from Illinois, and however much I agree with him in trying to cut down at all times, I am following his example set by his vote which was cast just a few minutes ago when he voted to increase the appropriation from \$63,000,000 to \$85,000,000. I cannot go along with the Senator on his amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. FULBRIGHT] I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 1, after the word "abroad" it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided further that \$10,000,000 shall be available for the exchange of persons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator address the Chair?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. There was some confusion when the vote on the last amendment was taken, and we did not know whether we were voting for my amendment or for the committee proposal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was no committee proposal. The Senator's amendment would have amended the text of the House bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on that amendment be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Chair will put the question again. As many as favor the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] will make it known by saying "aye." [Putting the question.]

The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Those in favor of the amendment will rise and stand until they are counted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, one moment. Is time permitted for debate on that question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is subject to debate of 20 minutes on each side.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois whether his amendment making provision for \$500,000, is for the Foreign Service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is for the Foreign Service, yes. It is for entertainment, primarily liquid in character. As the report says, "This appropriation is for the purpose of reimbursing officers of the Foreign Service for expenses, incurred at their post of duty, of entertainment necessary in the conduct of official duties and purchase of flowers, wreaths, and similar tokens for presentation in accordance with local custom on appropriate occasions."

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the entertainment is restricted to the use of the funds allowed or do the embassies contribute to the entertainment themselves?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not an expert on embassy entertaining, but in the process of entertaining guests, I am sure that there is no prohibition against members of the Foreign Service joining their guests, and themselves to drink alcoholic liquors.

Mr. WHERRY. What assurance does the Senator have that they invite guests?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think there is any assurance. I know of no restrictions against their entertaining each other. I may say that the Senator from

Michigan some weeks back brought out an item in the State Department budget which provided for something like \$35,000 for lunches to be given by the State Department. The average cost of each luncheon was approximately \$9. They were to have one foreigner in 1 case and 13 Americans largely out of the State Department personnel, and in another case 3 and 13. So that they were providing something like 3,000 lunches for State Department personnel and invited guests at \$9 a luncheon. I believe that has been eliminated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that has been eliminated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It has been eliminated due to the efforts of the Senator from Michigan, and he deserves a great deal of credit.

But the State Department should be aware of a tendency to substitute high living for high thinking.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe that the excessive costs of some of the luncheons which were attended largely by American delegates and a minority of foreign delegates is responsible in any way for some of the unfortunate deals which this country has made in the field of foreign affairs?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not certain that the deals were as unfortunate as the Senator from Vermont implies. But the State Department has shown itself, in the budget it has submitted, woefully careless of the taxpayers and woefully unconcerned about the taxpayers.

I must say that the \$9 luncheon proposal is like taking a boy to the circus. We see the father and the mother and the uncles and the aunts and the cousins going to the circus on the excuse that they have to take the boy to the circus. Similarly, the personnel of the State Department take these people out to lunch because they want a lunch themselves. And such lunches as the Department proposed. Think of them proposing \$9-per-plate lunches at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the Senator know that the \$9 lunches were in the program for the Voice of America, for which the Senator has just voted?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to say that they were eliminated before we voted on that, and I congratulate both the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Michigan for eliminating those items. But this representation allowance ought also to be cut. It is not necessary to entertain people with lavish amounts of alcohol in order to present the case of the United States. I again wish to make it clear that I am not a teetotaler and I am not posing as being opposed to alcohol, but I think it should be taken in moderation, and one should pay for it himself. It should not be charged up to the taxpayers.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New York.



Mr. LEHMAN. Do I correctly understand that the representation allowances which would be authorized by the section under consideration are for the foreign missions abroad?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I make an observation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. LEHMAN. All my life I have heard, and I think there is a great deal of justice in the report, that it was impossible to get men of moderate means to go into the Foreign Service, the Embassies, or consulates, because if they accepted those positions, they would draw heavily on their moderate resources. I think the practice of emphasizing alcoholic consumption in our foreign missions, if I may be perfectly frank with the Senator from Illinois, is overdone. I have been at many dinners, and I have had alcoholic beverages served to me, and I have enjoyed them, and I am quite sure that the Senator from Illinois has also.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not pretend to be a teetotaler.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am sure our Ambassador in London, in Paris, or in Belgium or Holland, or wherever he may be, will follow the usual practice which has been pursued for many generations in the serving of luncheons or dinners to diplomats from other countries, and important visitors from other countries. In view of the fact that we know that many men of moderate means are handicapped and are prevented from accepting these positions. It seems to me it does not make sense for us to erect a further obstacle to the carrying out of their duties. I do not believe alcoholic beverages make very much difference in the attitude of our guests.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am still yielding to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. It seems to be unfortunate that we should put an obstacle in the way of persons of small or moderate means accepting appointments to positions in the Foreign Service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out that we are still retaining half a million dollars for this purpose, which is quite a sum. Without wishing to be priggish, there would still seem to me to be a place in life for simplicity. At times it seems as though simplicity has almost vanished from the earth, but there certainly should be some place where simplicity may dwell. I do not see why we should adopt the lavish spending of a rather limited group as the standard by which we should run our Foreign Service. I know it is going to be hard on the gentlemen of the Foreign Service to have a cut of one-fourth made in their allowance for their intake of exotic food and liquor. But the taxpayers should also be considered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have traveled a great deal for many years. I have been entertained by our Ambassadors and by our consuls, and I have not seen any manifestation of lavish entertainment. Their

entertainment has been dignified. I think on the whole their entertainment has been reasonably simple, I believe more simple in many ways than the entertainment in households I have visited and which the Senator from Illinois has visited in this country. But the Senator from Nevada, with whom I do not always agree, has testified that even now it is necessary for every foreign officer to contribute \$200 out of his own funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is simply because they indulge in certain types of entertainment. I would suggest that the rules of the "club" should be simpler.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the senior Senator from New York?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask whether the Senator from New York is a friend or a foe.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York is a great admirer of the Senator from Illinois, and is merely trying to ascertain the truth about the matter under discussion. Is the Senator from Illinois certain that the \$175,000 which he proposes to deduct from this amount will be taken from the liquor bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it would diminish the total intake of alcoholic beverages.

Mr. IVES. Could it not also diminish the amount of food, and leave the liquor as it is?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It might even diminish the number of "wreaths" and similar items for presentation, for which the State Department says the money is to be used.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I feel like sitting down and letting other Members of the Senate speak in their own time. I think perhaps I shall do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. The only intimation of liquor in this matter comes from the vivid imagination of the able Senator from Illinois. So far as anyone knows, there is no liquor in this bill. Great Britain furnishes money for entertainment in her embassies and consulates, and she is outstanding for her entertainment. Other countries furnish their representatives, wherever they may be, with a sufficient amount of money so that they may properly represent their governments. We are perhaps the most miserly—if I may use the term—in the amount we provide by way of allowances to our representatives in the various countries in which they serve. It is really a small item, Mr. President. It is too small to quibble about. It would be a shame to cut out the item.

The fact of the matter is that the item should be multiplied, instead of being reduced, because the Government of the United States, representing the greatest democracy in the world, should be properly represented.

One can go into our embassies and consulates throughout the world and perhaps never see liquor and never hear of it, and yet be entertained. However,

it costs the ambassadors and the consuls and ministers who have to furnish the entertainment money out of their own pockets.

Today it is practically impossible for a poor man or a man of even limited means to represent this country at the Court of St. James's. We must select millionaires, men of great wealth, to represent the United States in its consulates and embassies. It is outrageous that the item should be cut down. It is too small now.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from Nevada no doubt is aware of the amount spent by the embassies of other countries in Washington for entertainment purposes, is he not?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am.

Mr. KILGORE. Does not the Senator from Nevada also realize that the amount we are considering is extremely modest, as compared with the amounts spent in Washington?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. And I am asking the Senator from Nevada a question. Is it not a fact that the amount allowed for entertainment purposes to American embassies is extremely modest, as compared with amounts available to embassies of foreign countries?

Mr. McCARRAN. I said that, and I repeat it now.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. A question was raised by the able Senator from Vermont as to whether or not a little too much alcohol had been around at times when some deals were made involving the United States. If the Senator would consult a book entitled "The Strange Alliance," by Major General Dean, who was the head of our military mission in Moscow during the war, he will find that in December 1944 Major General Dean wrote very vigorously to the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, on the subject, and stated specifically how we had been outwitted when there had been too much consumption of alcohol.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for the additional argument.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has yielded the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator from West Virginia desire to ask a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I ask the Senator from Nevada whether it is not a fact that although we cannot control what representatives in other embassies do, we must try to combat what other embassies are doing?

Mr. McCARRAN. I believe the Senator is right.



Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, has the Senator from Nevada exhausted his time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has some time remaining.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield some time to the Senator from Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I have before me section 1131 of title 22 of the United States Code, part of which is referred to in this appropriation item. I find that that particular section of the code embraces three subsections, each of which is almost self-explanatory and constitutes a necessary part of the financing of the representation abroad of our country in its relations with other countries.

The first subsection covers allowances for quarters, where the United States Government itself does not have quarters available, and for heat, light fuel, gas, and electricity. That would be expected.

The second of these subsections provides for cost of living allowances, where there is a finding that the cost of living in that particular assignment largely exceeds the cost of living in the United States to an amount which would offset that increase over the domestic cost of living. I believe we would all agree that that provision is exceedingly necessary and wholly reasonable.

The third subsection, which is the one that is in issue in this particular section of the appropriation bill, has to do with the covering of all expenses of every kind in connection with the entertainment which is expected and required of representatives of a great country like ours in the entertainment of our officials and officials and citizens of other countries who are guests in our embassies and consulates, and in entertaining our own citizens when they are there.

I shall read that section because it is so very clear that that is what it means.

SUBSEC. 3. Allowances in order to provide for the proper representation of the United States by officers or employees of the service.

Mr. President, it may well be that in some instances, in some places, and in the homes of some representatives, some portions of this very small appropriation, provided for use in conformity with the customs of the particular country where the entertainment is taking place, may be used for liquid refreshments. It might even be, Mr. President, that someone would like to have a coca cola, from back home, or perhaps other soft drinks of the kind we are accustomed to having at home.

Mr. President, it is quite evident that the great majority of this huge amount of \$675,000, to be expended all over the world, in the hundreds of places where we have representation for this great country, would go for the purchase of food and for obtaining the customary entertainment, which would be required in such nations.

I am willing and anxious to be economical. I approve very strongly of the action of the committee in cutting the appropriation for the State Department about one-fourth of the entire budgeted amount, or 24.99 percent. Even with the

change which was made and which I joined in making, raising the appropriation for the Voice of America to the amount allowed by the House, the total figure is still below the Budget Bureau figure by 19.6 percent.

I for one, although I consider myself to be a temperate person, do not propose to cast a vote for an amendment which would indicate that the Senate of the United States is adopting a niggardly attitude toward people, drawn from all branches of life, whether they be rich or of modest estate, to represent our Nation in the far-flung parts of the earth.

I rise to strongly support the position of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] because I feel that we would be upon weak ground, indeed, to insist upon a cut of \$175,000 in an appropriation of this kind, at a time when, for the first time in the history of our Nation, we are required and expected to assume leadership in the field of international relations throughout the world.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. In a moment I shall be glad to yield. Everyone knows that our colleges have been called upon to create additional facilities for the special education of our young men and young women who are to serve properly in this field. The greatest shortage we have suffered since World War II is in the lack of a sufficient number of trained personnel to represent us, and we are moving in every way we can to raise the number and qualifications of those who shall represent us. I for one am not willing by my vote to indicate that we would lower the living standard and the entertainment potentialities of people who are working day and night to represent us creditably and effectively in the far-flung corners of the earth, and most of whom are doing very fine, and splendidly, American jobs.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the Senator from Florida aware that at the end of the war in Europe an attempt was made by the British to bomb the harbor of Le Havre, in which the Germans were located; but the British airmen made a mistake in their daylight bombing and, instead, they blasted the entire center of Le Havre? Later the United States Air Force was requested to make a precision job of bombing the harbor of Le Havre. Our Air Force did a good job, and blew out the harbor. However, no one explained to the citizens of Le Havre that it was not the Americans who did the initial bombing which blew out the entire center of the city of Le Havre. I talked to our consul there. He informed me that after that bombing occurred, the people of Le Havre elected a Nazi as the mayor of the city, and the consul had to pay \$150 for a wreath to lay on the tomb of the unknown soldier there; and there were many additional expenses to which our consular agent was put.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida whether he is familiar

with those facts, which I think have a bearing on the Senator's contention in connection with this amendment, because when we make more than a reasonable reduction in the expense allowances to those who represent us abroad diplomatically, I think we crucify them.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his observation.

Mr. President, I have been, in a very modest way, to some of our Embassies and to other places where we have representatives on foreign soil. For instance, I was entertained at the time when the Subcommittee on Agriculture and Forestry was entertained not long ago by our former Ambassador to Mexico. I found that we were modestly entertained there. I found no extravagance of any sort there, but an abundance of excellent food along with typical American hospitality. It is absolutely inconceivable, to me, that the representatives of the United States could show any great amount of extravagance, and certainly they could display no misconduct of the type which has been mentioned here in expending the very modest, extremely small, almost penurious amount proposed to be allowed for all the thousands of persons who represent us in hundreds of places, to carry out in a gracious way their social obligations to the people among whom they are stationed, and also to entertain the United States officials and citizens who visit them in the course of their stay on foreign soil.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall not use that much time. I simply ask the Senate not to confuse the Voice of America with the breath of America. [Laughter.] We want a strong Voice of America, but I do not think the same requirement applies to the breath of America; I think we can diminish with profit the strength of the breath of America and increase the strength of the Voice of America. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, there are tucked away in the appropriations for the State Department various items which might be used for food and provender. There is an item of \$9,900,000 for "emergencies," for which no itemized accounting has to be made.

If we turn to the slip sheets, we find various items, such as "post allowances," which might also possibly be used to provide for food. These amount to approximately \$2,000,000. So those who represent us abroad are not to be turned out as orphans of the storm.

Therefore, Mr. President, I say very simply that I hope we vote to contribute to plain living, by voting to decrease to the extent of \$175,000 the amount of these allowances. I do not subscribe to the idea that because foreign embassies have a large consumption of alcoholic liquor, therefore, in order to keep in the swim, so to speak, we should attempt to imitate them and to follow their example.



So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, on page 4, in line 25.

On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GORGEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BRICKER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 40, as follows:

## YEAS—25

|             |                |              |
|-------------|----------------|--------------|
| Aiken       | Hunt           | Smith, Maine |
| Butler, Md. | Johnson, Colo. | Thye         |
| Carlson     | Kem            | Watkins      |
| Case        | Knowland       | Welker       |
| Douglas     | Langer         | Wherry       |
| Dworshak    | Malone         | Williams     |
| Ferguson    | Millikin       | Young        |
| Frear       | Mundt          |              |
| Humphrey    | Schoeppel      |              |

## NAYS—40

|              |               |             |
|--------------|---------------|-------------|
| Benton       | Johnson, Tex. | Morse       |
| Clements     | Kefauver      | Murray      |
| Connally     | Kerr          | Neely       |
| Cordon       | Kilgore       | Nixon       |
| Ellender     | Lehman        | Pastore     |
| Fulbright    | Lodge         | Robertson   |
| Green        | Long          | Russell     |
| Hayden       | Magnuson      | Saltonstall |
| Hendrickson  | McCarran      | Smathers    |
| Hennings     | McClellan     | Sparkman    |
| Hickenlooper | McFarland     | Stennis     |
| Hoyer        | McKellar      | Underwood   |
| Holland      | McMahon       |             |
| Ives         | Moody         |             |

## NOT VOTING—31

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Anderson      | Duff            | McCarthy     |
| Bennett       | Eastland        | Monroney     |
| Brewster      | Ecton           | O'Connor     |
| Bricker       | Flanders        | O'Mahoney    |
| Bridges       | George          | Smith, N. J. |
| Butler, Nebr. | Gillette        | Smith, N. C. |
| Byrd          | Hill            | Taft         |
| Cain          | Jenner          | Tobey        |
| Capehart      | Johnston, S. C. | Wiley        |
| Chavez        | Martin          |              |
| Dirksen       | Maybank         |              |

So the amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which was read before. I ask that it be read again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. Mr. MUNDT, for himself, and Mr. FULBRIGHT, proposes an amendment on page 16, line 1, after the word "abroad" to insert "Provided further, That \$10,000,000 shall be available for the exchange of persons."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, let me say that I have conferred with the chairman of the subcommittee regarding this amendment. It would not increase the amount of the appropriation. It is a perfecting amendment, which means that, of the \$85,000,000, \$10,000,000 shall be used for the exchange-of-persons program, because the subcommittee—and I congratulate them upon their work—included Ireland, Spain, Iceland, and other countries in the new exchange program for next year. So I think, if the chairman of the subcommittee is agreeable, there is no use discussing the amendment further.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I suspect the Senator from South Dakota is correct. There is one thing I would have liked. I would have liked to amend it by providing that \$9,000,000 of it should go to Ireland. [Laughter.]

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure that the personal character of the chairman will result in a good percentage of it going to Ireland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of

the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have a perfecting amendment which I should like to ask unanimous consent to make, because it requires unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator might send it forward, and have it read.

Mr. MUNDT. It is an amendment to the amendment on page 15, line 23, to change the figure "\$25,830,000" to "\$33,200,000." I have consulted the subcommittee, and I find that that is carrying out the same percentage limitation for personal services, so that the percentage limitation applied to the \$85,000,000 would apply to the \$63,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the offering of the amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope there will be no objection to this, because it carries out the same ratio as that with respect to the \$63,000,000 appropriation which has been increased. I refer to the ratio in respect to personal service.

Mr. MUNDT. Exactly. It keeps the whole thing in balance.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment affects only the personnel in the Voice of America program, and that it does not affect the voice of the State Department in the United States program?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. It has nothing to do with the latter.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask why the figure is approximately \$8,000,000.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the Senator talking about the exchange of personnel?

Mr. WHERRY. The increase is considerably more than that. It has been stated that that is the exact percentage. Will the Senator please explain that?

Mr. MUNDT. The figure is now \$25,830,000. I am advised by the committee clerk that with the new limitations and the new figure, \$33,200,000, the same general percentage arrangement is carried out which has been carried throughout the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Ten million dollars of the eighty-five million dollars has already been earmarked before exchange, so that is not involved.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 8-23-51-D.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,250,000" and insert "\$2,320,600."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 20 minutes.



Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this amendment is offered on behalf of myself, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The adoption of the amendment will make it possible to put into effect the National Youth Correction Act, which Congress approved last year. It is Public Law 865. So far as I know, it passed both Houses of Congress without a dissenting vote. It is the result of a long effort to set up a Youth Correction Board, which, in the words of the excellent report by Representative WALTER, of Pennsylvania, from the House Judiciary Committee, as to its purpose, it departs from the mere punitive idea of dealing with criminals and looks primarily to the objective ideal of rehabilitation. To implement this work in the Federal court procedure funds are required for the salaries of three board members authorized by the act, four assistant clerks and stenographers, and traveling and contingent expenses of \$6,900. The very modest request totaling \$70,600 is all that is required to enable the Department of Justice to go forward with the program urged by judges, lawyers, and experts in the field of rehabilitation of young offenders.

When the bill was before the Judiciary Committee, it was stated that it would take \$85,000 to put it into operation; but the Department of Justice asked for only \$70,600. The act permits Federal judges to commit young offenders under 22 years of age to a special youth board for such length of time as may be considered necessary to bring about their rehabilitation. The act is entirely discretionary with the courts, but Federal judges have hailed it with such enthusiasm that it seems certain it will be used almost exclusively as soon as the necessary machinery is established. Chief Justice John K. Parker and Justice Phillips, who has discussed the matter many times with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], took the lead in urging the legislation before the committee. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court has also manifested his great interest in the program in many ways, most recently by appointing his representatives on the Advisory Council which is authorized by the act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this activity is for the purpose of taking care of youth who are incarcerated. The House did not make appropriation, on the theory that it could be absorbed out of the appropriation for the Department of Justice. This is a worthy activity, and I am perfectly willing to take the item of \$70,600 to conference.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to compliment the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, at this point, a statement relating to the subject matter of the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE APPROPRIATIONS FOR NEW YOUTH OFFENDER DIVISION

The item on page 20 of the Justice appropriation bill in the amount of \$2,250,000 should be increased to \$2,320,600. This is to permit the appointment of the following:

|                                                   |          |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------|
| 3 new Board members at \$10,000 each (GS-15)----- | \$30,000 |
| 1 staff director (GS-13)-----                     | 7,600    |
| 2 case analysts (GS-10)-----                      | 10,000   |
| 1 supervisor of releases (GS-9)-----              | 4,600    |
| 4 clerk-stenographers (GS-4)-----                 | 11,500   |
| Traveling and contingent expenses-----            | 6,900    |
| Total-----                                        | 70,600   |

The foregoing appropriation request is \$14,400 less than the estimate submitted to the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate as the cost of implementing the Youth Offender Act. Public Law 865 was passed with this amount in view and authorized.

The act has been most favorably received by the United States courts and they are eagerly awaiting an opportunity to utilize it, which, of course, cannot occur until funds are available for the expenses of the Board.

I believe the act is urgently needed at this time. I realize we must proceed cautiously with new programs in these days, but here is one which holds so much promise for conserving manpower it cannot be postponed. Upward of 3,000 young men a year are now being sentenced to Federal prisons for an average of 18 months for various offenses ranging from automobile theft to draft evasion. If through this procedure we can save half of them for the defense effort, we will have stepped up our defenses just that much. I have been assured this is a not unreasonable goal. No money could be better spent.

Also in the work of our Committee on Organized Crime we saw many ways in which this new procedure would be most helpful. To take just one example, let me tell you how it would work with the young teenage drug users. As you know, the use of heroin, cocaine, and marijuana has been increasing alarmingly among young people. It doesn't do much good to send these unfortunate victims to prison for the short periods usually given by the courts. What they need is treatment in special institutions or hospitals and close supervision when they return home. The Youth Act will make that possible. The judges will have authority to commit them for an indefinite term up to a maximum of 6 years for first offenders and longer for repeaters confident that this special board will provide the special care they need, give them a trial in the community when they are cured, and bring them back if they revert to drugs. The saving in court and law-enforcement costs for this one type of offender will far offset the amount requested for this item. Mothers and fathers throughout the country are crying for a more intelligent way of handling those who fall prey to drugs. This act provides the answer.

Then there are a large number of sex offenders, borderline mental cases, and others being sent to prisons for definite terms who cannot be handled properly under usual methods. These cases require commitment for extended terms to a responsible group who can determine the kind of treatment needed and how long it should continue. That is just what this act does and no additional funds are requested for the correctional institutions of the Federal Prison System. All that is needed is money for the

Youth Board and a small group of staff assistants.

One final word about the need for action at this time. The military authorities are turning over practically all of the soldiers who get into trouble in this country for trial by the civil courts if their offense is also one over which the Federal courts have jurisdiction. Stealing a jeep, or embezzling funds in a post exchange, or stealing Government property are common examples. Many of these are really casualties of the service and in need of the kind of rehabilitative treatment this bill makes possible instead of being considered just another criminal requiring punishment alone. For these reasons I ask that the small appropriation requested be granted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have another amendment on the same page of the bill which I should like to offer at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,200,000" and insert "\$3,700,000."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this amendment will provide for an increase of \$500,000 for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

The amendment is justified on the basis of the litigation in which the Department of Justice is now engaged, and the special duties which are imposed on the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice by virtue of the Defense Production Act and the National Production Authority.

During the current fiscal year approximately 60,000 cases will come on for trial through the Antitrust Division. Although a number of them may be settled, at least half of them will have to be tried, in addition to the trial of the investment banking and other cases which will have to continued.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The estimate for the Antitrust Division was \$3,700,000. In 1950 it had \$3,750,000. The House made a reduction of \$500,000 in the estimate, making the amount \$3,200,000. The committee thought it well to go with the House on this item. I am willing to take the amendment to conference and thresh it out with the House conferees. I do not want to be in the position of saying that I am trying to defer action by the Antitrust Division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD a very short statement in connection with the work of the Antitrust Division be printed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the current fiscal year approximately 60 cases will come on for trial. Although a number of them will probably be settled by the entry of consent judgments, well over half will have to be tried. In addition, trial of the Investment Banking



and Cellophane cases will continue. The United Shoe Machinery litigation should be completed in the trial court at least. The taking of depositions in the du Pont-General Motors suit will continue, and much work will have to be done in the preparation of many other cases for trial which cannot be reached this fiscal year, including such cases as those against A. & P. and Western Electric. Approximately 240 investigations are under way, of which, it is planned, approximately 100 will be pressed to final conclusion during the current fiscal year. We suggest no figures as to new matters which will have to or should be handled by the Division during the coming months; however, past experience would indicate that the number will be substantial. Any diminution in the amount of the budget estimate of \$3,700,000 would seriously handicap the Antitrust Division in that it would be impossible for it to meet these demands made upon it.

The urgency of the situation is made more acute by the fact that, in addition to the traditional activities of the Antitrust Division under the antitrust laws, the Division is responsible for litigation and enforcement matters under kindred statutes, including the Defense Production Act of 1950. This latter act has placed heavy responsibilities on the Division, including the handling of all civil litigation arising out of the activities of the National Production Authority and the other coordinate defense agencies, and passing upon all voluntary agreements and arrangements submitted by the defense agencies and upon the form, effect, and conduct of advisory committees. Orders and Directives of the President require all agencies involved in the defense program to consult with the Attorney General whenever the action of those agencies might tend to suppress competition unduly, create or strengthen monopolies, injure small business, or otherwise promote undue concentration of economic power. This defense work of the Division is now a major responsibility of great public importance and must be effectively administered.

The Division's heavy current work load, to say nothing of new matters which will develop, will require full and complete utilization of the present staff, which is now being maintained at the 1951 appropriation level; it should continue to remain at that level if the present responsibilities of the Division are to be discharged.

The Antitrust Division's program for this fiscal year is firmly to move ahead with an energetic prosecution of pending cases, at the same time keeping alert to discover violations of the antitrust laws and promptly initiating necessary litigation where violations are found. In addition, the Division must discharge its many responsibilities under the defense and mobilization programs. Any reduction in funds available to the Antitrust Division would seriously and adversely affect its ability to carry on its very important activities. Such a curtailment of the Division's program of antitrust enforcement would be detrimental to the public interest.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on page 50 of the bill, line 3, I move to strike out "\$18,229,710" and insert "\$19,500,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That involves a committee amendment which was agreed to and will have to be reconsidered.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment may be reconsidered. Let me say to the Senate that this is for the purpose of putting back into the bill money which seems to be essential for the Weather Bureau stations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. FERGUSON. This does not increase the amount of money to the Weather Bureau, I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. It merely changes the item for personnel working in the field, scattered all over the United States and our possessions. Is that statement correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So it is difficult to apply the 10-percent rule because of the few persons who are employed in each department.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. The committee tried to apply the rule.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I am interested in the weather stations, especially those located in my section of the Middle West. I read on the ticker that some of the weather stations would have to be closed if the amount of the appropriation were not increased. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. It appears to be correct, and from the report we received from the Department, it is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am trying to find out. That is what the Senator from Nevada is attempting to prevent by asking that the amount be increased from \$18,000,000-plus to \$19,000,000-plus.

Mr. McCARRAN. To \$19,500,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say, before I yield, that the Senator from Michigan has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I hope very much that the Senate will agree to the unanimous-consent request. There is some question in my mind about the very vital weather station at Cape Henry on which the shipping along the coast depends. I have assured the people in that vicinity that the bill did not require or indicate the closing of that station. But I should much prefer to be on the safe side. That is not the only station which may be affected. It is especially important to keep in operation the weather stations along the coast.

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say to the Senator from Virginia that the station to which he refers is on the list that is reported to me as a list of stations that must be closed. Hence, I have offered the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I will say that it is very important to the Senator from Virginia not to make an erroneous statement to his constituents, because I could not believe that the Department would close so vital a station as that. I have not found provision for it in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask one more question of the Senator from Nevada. Will the proposed increase take care of a weather station at Scotts Bluff, Nebr., on which the range men depend almost 100 percent for weather fore-

casts, for warnings of storms? I should like to know if that station is mentioned.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not mentioned.

Mr. WHERRY. Then it would not be affected.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is not mentioned as being affected, so I take it would not be affected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment is agreed to. Without objection, the committee amendment on page 50, line 3, as amended, is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 8-22-51-H, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 43, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$325,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$300,000,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am proposing a cut of \$25,000,000 in the provision for Federal-aid highways. As I understand it, this is the precise recommendation made by the subcommittee. The subcommittee as I understand felt that a total of \$300,000,000 was sufficient. It is my impression that the full committee overruled the subcommittee and raised the ante by \$25,000,000. I think the subcommittee has done such a splendid job on this bill that we should give them a vote of confidence. We should support the subcommittee rather than the committee as a whole, which allowed itself to be carried away by the exuberance of expenditures. So I hope very much that we can hold up the hands of the very eminent chairman of the subcommittee and enable him to put through this economy for which he fought and bled. And while I know he is not acting in a dual capacity, not merely as chairman of the subcommittee, but as floor leader representing the whole committee, and therefore, in a sense, may be struggling against himself, I hope that on the whole he will speak not merely as the representative of the committee but as the vigorous subcommittee chairman who was able to secure a reduction in the subcommittee.

Mr. McKELLAR. What does the Senator mean by that? Does he mean that as a shot at me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no. I was thinking of the Senator from Nevada—

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to know what the Senator means by it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that I was speaking of the Senator from Nevada as the man representing the full committee who is steering the bill as a whole through, because he has been in charge of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator did not mean to reflect on the chairman of the committee?



Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I certainly did not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois correctly states the fact that the subcommittee reported \$300,000,000, and that the bill now carries \$325,000,000. The \$25,000,000 was put back into the bill by the full committee. This is liquidation money. It is to liquidate contracts already in existence; to pay off those contracts.

Mr. KERR and Mr. McCLELLAN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Is in fulfillment of the authorization made by the Congress?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. KERR. And is it for highway construction in the States in accordance with those authorizations?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Does it cover not only primary and urban road projects under the Federal-aid program but also farm-to-market roads?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator said it was for liquidation of obligations. Does the Senator mean the \$25,000,000 or the entire \$325,000,000?

Mr. McCARRAN. The entire amount.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The entire amount. In other words, that amount has already been programed by the Bureau of Federal Roads.

Mr. McCARRAN. The reason the subcommittee did not include the \$25,000,000 was that we thought the rate of payment would not require the \$25,000,000, but the judgment of the full committee was to the contrary.

Notwithstanding the plaudits and very nice expressions by my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, I must represent the full committee here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator does so unwillingly, does he not?

Mr. McCARRAN. No, I do not do it unwillingly. I do not do anything unwillingly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator do so out of a feeling of duty to the committee rather than the Senator's sober and mature judgment as expressed in the subcommittee?

Mr. McCARRAN. I want to say that it is the sober judgment of the Senator, not affected in any way whatever by the amendment the Senator from Illinois submitted a few minutes ago.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if the committee recommendation is not now \$95,000,000 below the budgetary request.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; it is \$95,000,000 below the budgetary request.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if he is aware of the fact that the Forest Service has a backlog of \$70,000,000 of road construction, and that we are allowing only \$17,000,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator correctly states the facts.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that this amendment will really not save any money in the end because the original legislation permits payment of the contractual obligations for the finishing of these roads?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. The contracts have been awarded.

Mr. FERGUSON. The contracts have been awarded and the projects are being constructed?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. And the question will be to what extent the roads will be completed, and the amount of the bills which actually will come to the United States Government during the present fiscal year.

Mr. McCARRAN. I will state again the reason why the subcommittee cut the amount by \$25,000,000. It was because we thought that the speed with which the payments would be made would not require \$25,000,000. The full committee thought otherwise.

Mr. FERGUSON. They seemed to have facts upon which they contended that there would be sufficient obligations so it would be necessary to use the full amount.

Mr. McCARRAN. The obligations will have to be paid sometime.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am a member of the subcommittee and also the full committee which dealt with the matter. I realize, of course, that the obligations have to be paid. There certainly is no doubt about that. The various figures represent an estimate as to what contracts will be fulfilled so that there will be money to meet them this year. The matter that perplexes me, however, is that the Bureau of the Budget recommended ninety-odd millions above the amount in question. Then the House cut the amount to \$325,000,000. Then the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations heard the evidence and thought the amount should be only \$300,000,000. Then when it came before the full committee, the committee decided the amount should be \$325,000,000. I should like to know why there is not agreement with respect to the estimates.

Mr. McCARRAN. The expenditures for the first 6 months of 1951 were \$143,129,610.

On that basis it was the judgment of the subcommittee that \$25,000,000 could be eliminated.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I presented the matter before the full committee. The reason why we thought that an additional amount of money would be required during the first half of the fiscal year, over what would be required in the second half, is that the construction season is mainly in the summertime.

Mr. WHERRY. Did not the Budget Bureau consider that factor when it submitted the estimates, and did not the House consider it? In the subcommittee \$300,000,000 seemed to be ample on the evidence which was disclosed. Was any new evidence submitted to the full committee which the subcommittee did not have, which would justify increasing the amount by \$25,000,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. I made the statement that I had talked with representatives of the Bureau of Public Roads, and that they stated that there had been more active competition among contractors, and that the work was progressing—

Mr. WHERRY. Faster?

Mr. HAYDEN. Faster than expected.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, it must be paid for anyway. I know that.

Mr. HAYDEN. It must be paid for anyway.

A further fact is that during the second 6 months of the calendar year more payments are required, because the season is open. During the first half of the calendar year the winter and spring must pass before work can proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. It seems that each time the subject comes before the committee there is a different state of facts upon which to make the decision. If the amount necessary is \$300,000,000, let us appropriate the \$300,000,000. If it is \$325,000,000, let us appropriate that amount. If it is more than that, inasmuch as it is authorized and the contracts will be processed, very well. I realize that this is only an estimate. The facts are considered first on one basis, and then on another, and the confusion is continued.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 4740) was passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amend-



ments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the sessions of the Senate to attend the Interparliamentary Union meeting at Istanbul, Turkey, as a delegate from the

Senate, under appointment by the Vice President, who is president of the organization in the United States. I ask to be excused until the meeting at Istanbul is over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AUTHORITY TO REPORT MUTUAL SECURITY BILL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Armed Services and Foreign Relations Committees may file a report on H. R. 5113, the Mutual Security Act for 1951, during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, August 27, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate August 24 (legislative day of August 1), 1951:

#### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Howard K. Travers, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Haiti.











California. My interest is in having San Diego and the other west-coast cities in southern California get their legal quotas with top priority and not bottom priority. Certainly I want San Diego to have her 112,000 acre-feet annually, half of which will be carried by this second barrel of the adeduct, but I want it to be as a part of the total California legal allotment and not in addition thereto.

#### ARMED SERVICES NURSING BILL

(Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, we have just finished the hearings on a nursing bill that I introduced last January, H. R. 910.

In view of the fact that \$61,000,000,000 has been appropriated for military purposes presupposes an emergency, recently we appropriated for an additional 120,000 hospital beds. I am wondering who is going to take care of the patients in those beds, for the nurse shortage is very real and grows more and more acute. H. R. 910 is the result of several years of study and many months of hard work. It has in it definite safeguards against Federal control and puts the ultimate control into the hands of this Congress where it belongs. It is the Congress that will decide the continuance or discontinuance of the program at any time it sees fit.

I have asked for this moment in order to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, my fellow Ohioan and Cleveland, the distinguished Mr. CROSSER, and to the members of the committee, and thank them for the consideration given to the witnesses and to myself in the entire matter. I hope very earnestly that the committee will meet shortly and bring the bill to the floor.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

#### FREE IMPORTATION OF BALER TWINE

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 366 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1005) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 170]

|                  |                 |                |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abernethy        | Fine            | Mansfield      |
| Adair            | Fisher          | Martin, Iowa   |
| Allen, Calif.    | Fogarty         | Meador         |
| Allen, La.       | Frazier         | Merrow         |
| Anderson, Calif. | Gamble          | Miller, Calif. |
| Andresen,        | Garmatz         | Mitchell       |
| August H.        | Gavin           | Morano         |
| Angell           | Gore            | Morgan         |
| Armstrong        | Granahan        | Morrison       |
| Bakewell         | Granger         | Murray, Tenn.  |
| Barrett          | Green           | Murray, Wis.   |
| Bates, Ky.       | Gwinn           | O'Konski       |
| Bentsen          | Hagen           | Ostertag       |
| Bishop           | Hall            | Patman         |
| Blackney         | Leonard W.      | Philbin        |
| Boggs, La.       | Harden          | Potter         |
| Bosone           | Hart            | Powell         |
| Boykin           | Harvey          | Quinn          |
| Breen            | Havener         | Rabaut         |
| Brooks           | Hébert          | Rains          |
| Brownson         | Fedrick         | Reams          |
| Buckley          | Heffernan       | Redden         |
| Busbey           | Heller          | Rees, Kans.    |
| Butler           | Hill            | Rhodes         |
| Canfield         | Hillings        | Richards       |
| Carlyle          | Hinshaw         | Rivers         |
| Carnahan         | Hoeven          | Roosevelt      |
| Case             | Hoffman, Ill.   | Sadlak         |
| Celler           | Holifield       | St. George     |
| Chatham          | Holmes          | Scott, Hardie  |
| Clemente         | Horan           | Scott,         |
| Clevenger        | Howell          | Hugh, D., Jr.  |
| Cole, N. Y.      | Hunter          | Secret         |
| Colmer           | Irving          | Shaffer        |
| Combs            | Jackson, Calif. | Sheehan        |
| Cooley           | Jackson, Wash.  | Shelley        |
| Corbett          | Jenison         | Sheppard       |
| Cotton           | Johnson         | Short          |
| Coudert          | Jonas           | Sikes          |
| Crawford         | Jones, Mo.      | Sittler        |
| Curtis, Nebr.    | Jones,          | Smith, Wis.    |
| Davis, Ga.       | Hamilton, C.    | Stefan         |
| Davis, Tenn.     | Kearns          | Stigler        |
| Dawson           | Kee             | Stockman       |
| Deane            | Kelly, N. Y.    | Tackett        |
| DeGraffenried    | Kennedy         | Talle          |
| Dempsey          | Kerr            | Taylor         |
| Denton           | Kersten, Wis.   | Teague         |
| Dollinger        | Kilburn         | Thomas         |
| Dolliver         | Klein           | Thornberry     |
| Donchue          | Lane            | Vall           |
| Donovan          | Latham          | Weichel        |
| Dorn             | Lecompte        | Wigglesworth   |
| Doyle            | Lesinski        | Wilson, Ind.   |
| Durham           | Lind            | Wilson, Tex.   |
| Eaton            | Lucas           | Withrow        |
| Ellsworth        | McCarthy        | Wolverton      |
| Elston           | McCormack       | Wood, Ga.      |
| Engle            | McCulloch       | Wood, Idaho    |
| Evins            | McGrath         | Yates          |
| Fenton           | Mack, Ill.      | Zablocki       |

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and forty-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### STATE, COMMERCE, JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROONEY, FLOOD, PRESTON, MARSHALL, CANNON, STEFAN, CLEVINGER, and TABER.

#### FREE IMPORTATION OF BALER TWINE

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time, 30 minutes, to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill (H. R. 1005) which amends the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material. The twine is now subject to a duty of 15 percent. Binder twine, which is almost the same thing, used for binding shocks of grain, has been on the duty-free list since 1896.

This resolution provides for 2 hours of general debate under an open rule. There are minority views, and I believe and amendment will be offered to make this temporary instead of permanent legislation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule on this side of the aisle, although I do understand there is some objection to the bill itself and that some amendments will be offered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, the speech of Candidate Truman dedicating the GAO Building in which he told the people that from 1947 through 1951, over the last 5 years, we have operated the Government with a surplus of nearly \$3,000,000,000, follows the same line of reckless statements used in the 1948 campaign.

In this same speech the President charged his critics with peddling "butterfly statistics" and "a pack of lies" about his conduct of Federal finances. He said the eight billion surplus he referred to was proof that he believed in operating the Government's finances on a sound basis. Let us see who is dealing in butterfly statistics, or worse.

The President, you will recall, based his campaign for reelection in 1948 largely in opposition to the record of the Eightieth Republican Congress during the years 1947 and 1948. The statistics his pencil men developed to enable the President to make his statement of an eight billion surplus over the past 5 years



had to begin with the year 1947 when the Republican Eightieth Congress cut the President's budget, over his opposition, which showed a surplus of \$754,000,000. His figures also included the year 1948 when the Republican Congress again cut his budget, with the result that it left a surplus of \$8,419,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, these figures show that the economy-minded Republican Eightieth Congress which Truman in his campaign said was the worst, or next worst, in history, balanced the budget for the first time in 16 years, reduced taxes by \$4,800,000,000, and showed a surplus for the two years, 1947 and 1948, which Mr. Truman proudly reports and takes credit for of \$9,173,000,000.

Mr. Truman boasts of nearly an \$8,000,000,000 surplus beginning with the year 1947 up to and through 1951, but he does not tell the American people that the do-nothing Republican Eightieth Congress is responsible for this surplus.

Mr. Truman either completely forgot to explain that the Republican Congress was responsible for the surplus, over the opposition of the President and his leaders, or else his statement is intended to deceive the American people. The small and only surplus he or his predecessors can rightly claim credit for in the past 20 years, is the 1951 surplus of \$3,510,000,000 which resulted because tax money came in faster than they could spend it. It was later wiped out 2 months after July 1. In fact, Mr. Truman and his administration during the last 3 years of those 5 years when they had control of Congress not only spent the \$9,173,000,000 left by the Republican Congress in 1947 and 1948 but spent the 1951 surplus he refers to and \$1,422,000,000 in addition. His party has not, in fact, really balanced the budget in the past 20 years.

The following table of receipts and expenditures should be of interest:

| Fiscal years ending June 30 | Expenditures     | Receipts         | Surplus (+) or deficit (-) |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| 1947-----                   | \$39,289,000,000 | \$40,043,000,000 | +\$754,000,000             |
| 1948-----                   | 33,791,000,000   | 42,211,000,000   | +8,419,000,000             |
| 1949-----                   | 40,057,000,000   | 38,246,000,000   | -1,811,000,000             |
| 1950-----                   | 40,167,000,000   | 37,045,000,000   | -3,122,000,000             |
| 1951-----                   | 44,633,000,000   | 48,143,000,000   | +3,510,000,000             |

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard from my colleague from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] the usual type of propaganda put out by the highly paid publicity staff of the Republican National Committee, prepared in advance for use whenever the opportunity presents itself on the floor of this House to question the motives, the integrity, and the purposes of our great President, Harry S. Truman. In his speech several days ago, the President stated very clearly and precisely what his views were on economy. He has practiced such a policy, the truth of which cannot be denied, notwithstanding the statement of my colleague from Illinois to the contrary. Unfortunately, the Republicans feel hurt whenever the President calls

attention to their shortcomings, and naturally they feel that by unleashing criticism such as we have just heard, by finding fault with every utterance of the President, they hope to be able to deceive the American people, instead of, as they charge, the President deceiving them.

Contrary to the old adage about the elephant's memory, the followers of this slow-plodding animal have apparently already forgotten that the same tactics of criticizing and criticizing were used in the last campaign, and up to election day they sincerely believed they had fooled a majority of the American people into believing their false claims, but when the returns were in it was found that thinking Americans had again supported the President and his policies by assuring him another 4 years in the White House. I am more than satisfied that he will again succeed, if he chooses to become a candidate for reelection, in being retained at the head of our great Government, thus safeguarding the country from Republican misrule, from which it has suffered on occasion in the past.

It is amazing to me that they should be against this bill. Of course, the Democrats have always been helpful to the farmers. We have been helping them in every way. We provide everything for them, even to the extent of bringing in, expense free, Mexican labor. In this bill we are again trying to help the tillers of the soil by relieving them of the 15 percent tariff on baler twine. I do not know of what more we can do for them than we have already done. The Republicans, I note, have submitted a minority report, signed by eight Members. Just think of it. They go out to the country, to the farmers, here and there, and tell what great friends they are of the farmers, and when we, the Democrats, bring out legislation in the interest of the farmers, the Republicans invariably oppose it. As it is, here is a minority report as I have stated signed by eight Republicans, outstanding Members, against this legislation that aims to aid and assist the farmers. I understand the four great farm organizations are asking for this legislation, and it was upon the testimony and pleadings of farmers and these farm organizations that the Committee on Ways and Means reported this bill. Notwithstanding, as I stated earlier, eight outstanding Republicans signed the minority report against this bill that is intended to give this additional aid to the farmers, carrying out the policy of the Democratic Party to do everything humanly possible for the farming communities and for the farmers of this country. I congratulate the Committee on Ways and Means for bringing the bill in, not that I believe the farmers are really deserving. The farmers have become more prosperous than in all history under the Democratic administration. I do not know whether they always appreciate or recognize what we, I mean the Democratic Party, have done for them. If they are sensible, honest and sincere, and interested in the future welfare, they will show their appreciation by supporting the

Democratic Party which has brought continued prosperity not only to the farmers but to the entire Nation.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not want to talk on the rule because I think that perhaps in general debate we will get a little bit more information about this bill. I do not intend to vote against this rule, although I think it ought to be defeated. The gentleman on the Democratic side who is in charge of this bill is one of the outstanding Members of the House. He thinks as I do about this, that perhaps we ought to have a real explanation of this bill.

The gentleman from Illinois who preceded me, when he talked about how much the Democrats had done for the farmers, was making what he probably thought was a good argument, but it had little to do with the discussion before us.

Mr. Speaker, this bill hurts two of the best industries that are established in the State of Massachusetts. There are only about seven more in the whole United States that make binder twine or any other kind of twine or who are in the business of producing rope. There are people in my district who have been employed by the Plymouth Cordage Co. and the New Bedford Cordage Co. for 50 years, and a great many of them have been employed for 35 years. They know their business. This bill hurts them materially.

Mr. Speaker, I would be lax in my duty if I did not stand here and call your attention to this matter, because in the town of Plymouth alone I suppose there are 1,300 or 1,400 employees working in this industry, and if you include their families there must be 4,000 or 5,000 people dependent upon this industry for their living. They have done a good job, the best that could be done by people in the United States. So why would I not stand here and ask you to defeat this bill in its entirety?

The question of the tariff may enter into this matter, but the question of people walking the streets may make a big difference to the people of this country, because we have been through it and we do not want them to do it again. We do not want slave labor to compete with the people in Plymouth and New Bedford.

I ask the Members of the House, even if you adopt this rule, to defeat the bill. Let us have another year to look at it. The Committee on Ways and Means is looking desperately for more money. This bill calls for less money, when the Committee on Ways and Means is looking for more.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, somebody's figures are off somewhere. According to the best information I can get, about 1,000 workers are employed in the baler-twine and binder-twine phase of cordage production and of that number not over 500 are engaged in the pro-











DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND  
THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

---

OCTOBER 10, 1951.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. ROONEY, from the committee of conference,  
submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 4740]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 10, 12, 13, 19, 22, 23, 26, 30, 38, 50, 52, 64, 80, 90, 93, 98, and 106.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, and 108, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert *not to exceed \$200,000 for the settlement of claims as authorized by Public Law 455, approved March 10, 1950*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *\$74,200,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.



Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$7,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$34,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$6,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,285,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$2,245,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$10,415,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$3,060,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$74,970,000; and the Senate agree to the same.



## Amendment numbered 47:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$22,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 51:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$875,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 60:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$325,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 65:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert *purchase (not to exceed one for replacement only) and*; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 66:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,625,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 68:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$12,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same

## Amendment numbered 69:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$8,399,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

## Amendment numbered 77:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$9,343,500; and the Senate agree to the same.



Amendment numbered 78:

That the House reeede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$3,183,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81:

That the House reeede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84:

That the House reeede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91:

That the House reeede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$25,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

*SEC. 603. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant after August 1, 1951, through the fiscal year 1952: Provided, That this inhibition shall not apply—*

(a) *to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;*

(b) *to positions filled from within the department;*

(c) *to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;*

(d) *to the Department of Justice, except general administration personnel;*

(e) *to the Federal Bureau of Investigation;*

(f) *to the Judiciary Branch;*



- (g) to the Civil Aeronautics Administration;
- (h) to the operational personnel of the Weather Bureau, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Bureau of Public Roads;
- (i) to the Patent Office;
- (j) to the Civil Aeronautics Board;
- (k) to employees under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 as amended;
- (l) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2:

*Provided, further, That when the total number of personnel in a department subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

*SEC. 605. Except for the automobiles officially assigned to the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, automobiles assigned for operation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and one-half of the chauffeur-driven automobiles in operation in the Departments on July 1, 1951, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose primary duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.*



And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 79, 103, 104½, and 107.

JOHN J. ROONEY,  
DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
PRINCE H. PRESTON,  
FRED MARSHALL,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
CLIFF CLEVINGER (except  
as to amendment No.  
106),

JOHN TABER (except as to  
amendment No. 106),

BEN F. JENSEN (except as  
to amendment No. 106),

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

PAT McCARRAN,  
KENNETH McKELLAR,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,  
STYLES BRIDGES (I do not  
sign this conference re-  
port as to amendment  
No. 106; reserving the  
right to move in Senate to  
have a new conference),

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (I  
do not sign this confer-  
ence report as to amend-  
ment No. 106; reserving  
the right to move in Sen-  
ate to have a new confer-  
ence),

HOMER FERGUSON (I do  
not sign this conference  
report as to amendment  
No. 106; reserving the  
right to move in Senate  
to have a new confer-  
ence),

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*



## STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 1—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that funds for operation of the International Claims Commission shall be available from this appropriation as proposed by the Senate and places a limitation thereon of \$200,000. The accounts of the Department are to be so kept as to specifically record the exact expenses of the International Claims Commission inasmuch as the total cost for the Commission is to be restricted to the over-all 3 percent of claims adjusted.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3—*Salaries and expenses*: Strike out language proposed by the Senate authorizing not to exceed \$200,000 for maintenance and operation of commissary and mess services.

Amendment No. 4—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$74,200,000, instead of \$73,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$74,487,777 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$56,079,253 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not less than \$7,500,000 of this appropriation shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House. The amount of \$7,500,000 is to apply to the last 9 months of fiscal year 1952.

Amendment No. 7—*Acquisition of buildings abroad*: Appropriates \$7,500,000, instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—*Acquisition of buildings abroad*: Provides that not to exceed \$94,500 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—*Contributions to international organizations*: Appropriates \$30,297,861 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$27,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—*Contributions to international organizations*: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate appropriating such additional sums due to increase in rates of exchange as the Secretary of State may determine to be necessary to pay, in foreign currencies,



the quotas and contribution required by the several treaties, conventions, or laws established by the amount of the obligation.

Amendment No. 11—*Missions to international organizations*: Provides that not to exceed \$1,179,540 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—*Missions to international organizations*: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate providing that employment under this appropriation in connection with the Organization of American States may be without regard to the civil-service laws.

Amendment No. 13—*International contingencies*: Strikes out the language proposed by the Senate providing medical and hospital expenses of members of United States delegations while in a travel status outside the United States.

Amendment No. 14—*International contingencies*: Appropriates \$2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15—*International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico*: Provides for expenditures for the purposes set forth in sections 101 through 104 of Public Law 786, approved September 13, 1950, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16—*International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$737,550 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17—*International Boundary Water Commission, United States and Mexico, construction*: Appropriates \$12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$14,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18—*International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, construction*: Provides that not to exceed \$1,188,939 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19—*American sections, international commissions*: Appropriates \$702,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$687,200 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that not more than \$60,000 of this amount shall be available for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

Amendment No. 20—*American sections, international commissions*: Provides that not to exceed \$268,888 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21—*International Claims Commission*: Strikes out separate appropriation for this Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22—*International information and educational activities*: Strikes out the language of the Senate authorizing the purchase of nine passenger motor vehicles.

Amendment No. 23—*International information and educational activities*: Strikes out the language proposed by the Senate providing for expenses of hospitalization and medical care of grantees who become incapacitated while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation.

Amendment No. 24—*International information and educational activities*: Provides that not to exceed \$34,000,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$33,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.



Amendment No. 25—*International information and educational activities*: Provides that \$6,500,000 shall be available for exchange of persons instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26—*International information and educational activities*: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate providing that no part of this appropriation shall be expended for subscriptions to or distribution of any privately edited or published magazines, journals, or newspapers unless copies thereof are regularly filed with the Secretary of the Senate and with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

It is the intention of the conferees that no part of the funds appropriated herein are to be used for the purchase of radio sets for free distribution.

## DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

### LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 27—*Salaries and expenses, general administration*: Appropriates \$2,285,000, instead of \$2,250,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,320,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28—*Salaries and expenses, general administration*: Provides that not to exceed \$2,245,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$2,145,690 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—*Salaries and expenses, general legal activities*: Provides that not to exceed \$7,774,150 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30—*Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division*: Appropriates \$3,200,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31—*Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division*: Provides that not to exceed \$3,035,932 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32—*Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals*: Provides that not to exceed \$10,415,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$10,316,390 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33—*Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry*: Provides that not to exceed \$219,800 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

### FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Amendment No. 34—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$78,473,211 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

### IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Amendment No. 35—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$30,159,900 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.



## FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Amendment No. 36—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons*: Provides that not to exceed \$15,387,450 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37—*Support of United States prisoners*: Provides that not to exceed \$217,200 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

## OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

Amendment No. 38—*Salaries and expenses*: Makes available for general administrative expense \$3,600,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$3,060,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$2,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 40—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$1,484,530 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House. Of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$120,000 shall be available for Under Secretary of Transportation and Office of Transportation.

Amendment No. 41—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$1,363,230 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42—*Technical and scientific services*: Provides that not to exceed \$224,280 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

## BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Amendment No. 43—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$5,623,973 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44—*Seventeenth decennial census*: Provides that not to exceed \$5,646,654 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45—*Censuses of business, transportation, manufactures, and mineral industries*: Provides that not to exceed \$147,812 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

## CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 46—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$74,970,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$75,971,477 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47—*Establishment of air-navigation facilities*: Appropriates \$22,500,000, instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.



Amendment No. 48—*Establishment of air-navigation facilities*: Provides that not to exceed \$4,965,300 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49—*Technical development and evaluation*: Provides that not to exceed \$916,063 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50—*Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport*: Appropriates \$1,300,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,257,984 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—*Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport*: Provides that not to exceed \$875,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$828,145 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52—*Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act*: Makes funds available until 1954 as proposed by the House instead of 1958 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53—*Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act*: Appropriates \$28,700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$35,840,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54—*Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act*: Provides that \$15,000,000 shall be for projects in the States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55—*Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act*: Provides that \$10,000,000 shall be for liquidation of prior contract authority as proposed by the Senate instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 56 and 57—*Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act*: Provide that \$2,700,000 shall be for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,840,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58—*Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act*: Provides that \$450,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 59—*Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act*: Provides that not to exceed \$1,937,447 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60—*Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory of Alaska*: Appropriates \$325,000, instead of \$225,000 as proposed by the House and \$350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61—*Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory of Alaska*: Provides that not to exceed \$315,753 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62—*Air-navigation development*: Appropriates \$1,874,562 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,883,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 63—*Air-navigation development*: Provides that not to exceed \$75,937 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64—*Transport-aircraft development*: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$597,500 for carrying out the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 867).



## CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Amendment No. 65—*Salaries and expenses*: Authorizes the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle instead of four as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$3,-625,000, instead of \$3,550,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$3,354,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

## COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Amendment No. 68—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$12,-200,000, instead of \$12,375,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,-877,688 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$8,399,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$8,075,810 as proposed by the Senate.

## BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Amendment No. 70—*Departmental salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$2,641,869 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 71—*Field office service*: Appropriates \$1,953,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72—*Field office service*: Provides that not to exceed \$1,593,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73—*Export control*: Appropriates \$5,388,180 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 74—*Export control*: Provides that not to exceed \$4,606,380 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 75—*Export control*: Provides that not to exceed \$99,000 of the amount which may be transferred to "Salaries and expenses" under the Office of the Secretary may be used for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

## PATENT OFFICE

Amendment No. 76—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$8,834,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

## BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

Amendment No. 77—*Federal-aid highways*: Provides that not to exceed \$9,343,500 shall be available for personal services instead of \$8,563,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78—*Forest highways*: Provides that not to exceed \$3,183,500 shall be available for personal services instead of \$2,914,200 as proposed by the Senate.



Amendment No. 79—*Public lands highways*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 80—*Tongass Forest highways, Alaska*: Appropriates \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,480,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 81—*Tongass forest highways, Alaska*: Provides that not to exceed \$200,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$180,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 82—*Inter-American Highway*: Appropriates \$3,000,000, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83—*Inter-American Highway*: Provides that not to exceed \$315,900 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84—*Access roads (act of September 7, 1950)*: Appropriates \$1,500,000, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

Amendment No. 85—*Operation and administration*: Provides that not to exceed \$490,203 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 86—*Research and testing*: Appropriates \$3,807,419 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 87—*Research and testing*: Provides that not to exceed \$3,083,228 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 88—*Radio propagation and standards*: Appropriates \$2,735,220 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 89—*Radio propagation and standards*: Provides that not to exceed \$1,483,020 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 90—*Working capital fund*: Appropriates \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

#### WEATHER BUREAU

Amendment No. 91—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$25,500,000, instead of \$26,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$25,069,477 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 92—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$19,500,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 93—Strikes out the language proposed by the Senate making available not to exceed \$5,000 for entertainment of prominent persons, representatives, and dignitaries of foreign governments.



## THE JUDICIARY

## SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendment No. 94—*Care of the building and grounds*: Provides that not to exceed \$147,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

## COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

Amendment No. 95—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$176,715 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

## CUSTOMS COURT

Amendment No. 96—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$401,165 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

## COURT OF CLAIMS

Amendment No. 97—*Salaries and expenses*: Provides that not to exceed \$495,580 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

## OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

Amendment No. 98—*Miscellaneous expenses*: Appropriates \$750,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$768,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 99—*Administrative Office of the United States Courts*: Provides that not to exceed \$488,500 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 100—*Expenses of referees*: Provides that not to exceed \$800,010 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

## FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

Amendment No. 101—Provides that not to exceed \$263,274 shall be available for personal services for administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 102—Provides that not to exceed \$344,796 shall be available for personal services for expenses of vocational training of prisoners, as proposed by the Senate.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 103—*Section 602*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 104—*Section 603*: Restores the provision of the House, with certain amendments, limiting the filling of vacancies.

Amendment No. 104½—*Employees engaged in personnel work*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 105—*Limitation on employment of chauffeurs*: Inserts the language proposed by the Senate limiting the number of chauffeurs in the District of Columbia as amended to except one-half of the number on the rolls as of July 1, 1951.



Amendment No. 106—Strikes out the proposal of the Senate relating to persons engaged in information activities.

Amendment No. 107—*Section 606*: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 108—Corrects section number.

JOHN J. ROONEY,  
DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
PRINCE H. PRESTON,  
FRED MARSHALL,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
CLIFF CLEVINGER (except  
as to amendment No. 106),  
JOHN TABER (except  
as to amendment No. 106),  
BERT F. JENSEN (except  
as to amendment No. 106),  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*









Mr. SPRINGER. I understand you to say that he has now issued a directive which, in substance, overrules the Defense Production Act?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Did I understand that correctly?

Mr. BOW. Yes. This regulation, and which the Secretary of the Interior, acting as PAD Administrator, says that he may issue directives. He says that his directives shall take precedence over the provisions of any rate schedule, tariff, regulation, or order of any regulatory body, including the regulatory bodies of the several States and Territories. In other words, he has said in this regulation that he can issue a directive which will take precedence over any State order, which would include distribution, not only of natural gas but of petroleum; and, under the NPA Act, as I interpret it, he has simply authority to intervene before regulatory bodies and present the position of the NPA; not to issue regulations or directives which would overrule any rate or tariff which they might make.

Mr. SPRINGER. I believe your amendment left it to the States which had regulatory bodies regulating these things, to regulate them entirely. Is that not contained within the Defense Production Act?

Mr. BOW. That is right. The so-called Bow amendment provided that where States had regulatory bodies exercising jurisdiction, they would so certify, and that no order of the PAD, or any other body, would take precedence over the State, and the State would retain its rights. What this does is again show an executive department attempting to usurp the functions of the States.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understand the gentleman has written the PAD Director. Is that correct?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. And has had no answer?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. I trust the gentleman will further pursue this and bring it to the attention of the House at the earliest moment. I think there are Members in this body who will seek to support him in that, to find out what the PAD Director is attempting to do and how he is attempting to usurp the powers which were taken away from him under the Defense Production Act, and returned to the regulatory body of the various States.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Commit-

tee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate on the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, be extended 1 hour, half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, does that include sufficient time for others of us who are interested in this over-all proposition to be recognized for some time? I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. The final 50 minutes on this side was yielded to our good friend, and some of us have been foreclosed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I will take care of the gentleman for 10 minutes out of that time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### REPORT ON STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY submitted the following conference report and statement:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1123)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4740) "making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 3, 10, 12, 13, 19, 22, 23, 26, 30, 38, 50, 52, 64, 80, 90, 93, 98 and 106.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102 and 103, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "not to exceed \$200,000 for the settlement of claims as authorized by Public Law 455, approved March 10, 1950;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$74,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$34,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,285,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$2,245,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$10,415,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$3,060,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$74,970,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$22,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.



Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "purchase (not to exceed one for replacement only) and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$8,399,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$9,343,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$3,183,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$25,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 603. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant after August 1, 1951, through the fiscal year 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the department;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President

by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to the Department of Justice, except general administration personnel;

"(e) to the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

"(f) to the Judiciary Branch;

"(g) to the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

"(h) to the operational personnel of the Weather Bureau, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Bureau of Public Roads;

"(i) to the Patent Office;

"(j) to the Civil Aeronautics Board;

"(k) to employees under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 as amended;

"(l) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel in a department subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 605. Except for the automobiles officially assigned to the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, automobiles assigned for operation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and one-half of the chauffeur-driven automobiles in operation in the Departments on July 1, 1951, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose primary duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 79, 103, 104½, and 107.

JOHN J. ROONEY,  
DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
PRINCE H. PRESTON,  
FRED MARSHALL,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
CLIFF CLEVINGER (except 106),  
JOHN TABER (except 106),  
BEN F. JENSEN (except 106),  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

PAT MCCARRAN,  
KENNETH MCKELLAR,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,  
STYLES BRIDGES (I do not sign this conference report as to amendment No. 106; reserving the right to move in Senate to have a new conference),

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL (I do not sign this conference report as to amendment No. 106; reserving the right to move in Senate to have a new conference),

HOMER FERGUSON (I do not sign this conference report as to amendment No. 106; reserving the right to move in Senate to have a new conference),

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4740) making

appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses: Provides that funds for operation of the International Claims Commission shall be available from this appropriation as proposed by the Senate and places a limitation thereon of \$200,000. The accounts of the Department are to be so kept as to specifically record the exact expenses of the International Claims Commission inasmuch as the total cost for the Commission is to be restricted to the overall 3% of claims adjusted.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3—Salaries and expenses: Strike out language proposed by the Senate authorizing not to exceed \$200,000 for maintenance and operation of commissary and mess services.

Amendment No. 4—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$74,200,000, instead of \$73,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$74,487,777 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$56,079,253 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not less than \$7,500,000 of this appropriation shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House. The amount of \$7,500,000 is to apply to the last nine months of fiscal year 1952.

Amendment No. 7—Acquisition of buildings abroad: Appropriates \$7,500,000, instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Acquisition of buildings abroad: Provides that not to exceed \$94,500 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—Contributions to international organizations: Appropriates \$30,297,861 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$27,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—Contributions to international organizations: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate appropriating such additional sums due to increase in rates of exchange as the Secretary of State may determine to be necessary to pay, in foreign currencies, the quotas and contribution required by the several treaties, conventions, or laws established by the amount of the obligation.

Amendment No. 11—Missions to international organizations: Provides that not to exceed \$1,179,540 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12—Missions to international organizations: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate providing that employment under this appropriation in connection with the Organization of American States may be without regard to the civil service laws.

Amendment No. 13—International contingencies: Strikes out the language proposed by the Senate providing medical and hospital expenses of members of United States delegations while in a travel status outside the United States.

Amendment No. 14—International contingencies: Appropriates \$2,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico: Provides for expenditures for the purposes set forth in sections 101 through 104 of Public Law 786, approved



September 13, 1950, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$737,550 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, construction: Appropriates \$12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$14,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, construction: Provides that not to exceed \$1,188,939 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19—American sections, international commissions: Appropriates \$702,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$687,200 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that not more than \$60,000 of this amount shall be available for the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

Amendment No. 20—American sections, international commissions: Provides that not to exceed \$268,888 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21—International Claims Commission: Strikes out separate appropriation for this Commission, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22—International information and educational activities: Strikes out the language of the Senate authorizing the purchase of nine passenger motor vehicles.

Amendment No. 23—International information and educational activities: Strikes out the language proposed by the Senate providing for expenses of hospitalization and medical care of grantees who become incapacitated while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation.

Amendment No. 24—International information and educational activities: Provides that not to exceed \$34,000,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$33,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25—International information and educational activities: Provides that \$6,500,000 shall be available for exchange of persons instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26—International information and educational activities: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate providing that no part of this appropriation shall be expended for subscriptions to or distribution of any privately edited or published magazines, journals or newspapers unless copies thereof are regularly filed with the Secretary of the Senate and with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

It is the intention of the conferees that no part of the funds appropriated herein are to be used for the purchase of radio sets for free distribution.

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

##### *Legal activities and general administration*

Amendment No. 27—Salaries and expenses, general administration: Appropriates \$2,285,000, instead of \$2,250,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,320,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28—Salaries and expenses, general administration: Provides that not to exceed \$2,245,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$2,145,690 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—Salaries and expenses, general legal activities: Provides that not to exceed \$7,774,150 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30—Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division: Appropriates \$3,200,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31—Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division: Provides that not to exceed \$3,035,932 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32—Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals: Provides that not to exceed \$10,415,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$10,316,390 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33—Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry: Provides that not to exceed \$219,800 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

#### *Federal Bureau of Investigation*

Amendment No. 34—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$78,473,211 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

#### *Immigration and Naturalization Service*

Amendment No. 35—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$30,159,900 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

#### *Federal prison system*

Amendment No. 36—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons: Provides that not to exceed \$15,387,450 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37—Support of United States prisoners: Provides that not to exceed \$217,200 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

#### *Office of Alien Property*

Amendment No. 38—Salaries and expenses: Makes available for general administrative expense \$3,600,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$3,060,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$2,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

##### *Office of the Secretary*

Amendment No. 40—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$1,484,530 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House. Of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$120,000 shall be available for Under Secretary of Transportation and Office of Transportation.

Amendment No. 41—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$1,363,230 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42—Technical and scientific services: Provides that not to exceed \$224,280 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

#### *Bureau of the Census*

Amendment No. 43—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$5,623,973 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44—Seventeenth decennial census: Provides that not to exceed \$5,646,654 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45—Censuses of business, transportation, manufactures, and mineral industries: Provides that not to exceed \$147,812 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

#### *Civil Aeronautics Administration*

Amendment No. 46—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$74,970,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$75,971,477 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47—Establishment of air navigation facilities: Appropriates \$22,500,000, instead of \$20,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$25,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48—Establishment of air navigation facilities: Provides that not to exceed \$4,965,300 shall be available for per-

sonal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49—Technical development and evaluation: Provides that not to exceed \$916,063 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50—Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport: Appropriates \$1,300,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,257,984 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport: Provides that not to exceed \$875,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$828,145 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Makes funds available until 1954 as proposed by the House instead of 1958 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Appropriates \$28,700,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$35,840,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Provides that \$15,000,000 shall be for projects in the States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Provides that \$10,000,000 shall be for liquidation of prior contract authority as proposed by the Senate instead of \$15,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 56 and 57—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Provide that \$2,700,000 shall be for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,840,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Provides that \$450,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and Expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 59—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Provides that not to exceed \$1,937,447 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60—Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory of Alaska: Appropriates \$325,000, instead of \$225,000 as proposed by the House and \$350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 61—Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory of Alaska: Provides that not to exceed \$315,753 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62—Air navigation development: Appropriates \$1,874,562 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,883,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 63—Air navigation development: Provides that not to exceed \$75,937 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64—Transport aircraft development: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$597,500 for carrying out the provisions of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 867).

#### *Civil Aeronautics Board*

Amendment No. 65—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle instead of four as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$3,625,000, instead of \$3,550,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$3,354,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.



*Coast and Geodetic Survey*

Amendment No. 68—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$12,200,000, instead of \$12,375,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,877,688 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 69—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$8,399,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$8,075,810 as proposed by the Senate.

*Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce*

Amendment No. 70—Departmental salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$2,641,869 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 71—Field office service: Appropriates \$1,953,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72—Field office service: Provides that not to exceed \$1,593,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73—Export control: Appropriates \$5,388,180 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 74—Export control: Provides that not to exceed \$4,606,380 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 75—Export control: Provides that not to exceed \$99,000 of the amount which may be transferred to "Salaries and Expenses" under the Office of the Secretary may be used for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

*Patent Office*

Amendment No. 76—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$8,834,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

*Bureau of Public Roads*

Amendment No. 77—Federal-aid highways: Provides that not to exceed \$9,343,500 shall be available for personal services instead of \$8,563,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78—Forest highways: Provides that not to exceed \$3,183,500 shall be available for personal services instead of \$2,914,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 79—Public lands highways: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 80—Tongass Forest highways, Alaska: Appropriates \$3,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,480,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 81—Tongass Forest highways, Alaska: Provides that not to exceed \$200,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$180,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 82—Inter-American highway: Appropriates \$3,000,000, instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83—Inter-American highway: Provides that not to exceed \$315,900 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 84—Access roads (act of September 7, 1950): Appropriates \$1,500,000, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

*National Bureau of Standards*

Amendment No. 85—Operation and administration: Provides that not to exceed \$490,203 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 86—Research and testing: Appropriates \$3,807,419 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 87—Research and testing: Provides that not to exceed \$3,083,228 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 88—Radio propagation and standards: Appropriates \$2,735,220 as pro-

posed by the Senate instead of \$2,800,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 89—Radio propagation and standards: Provides that not to exceed \$1,483,020 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 90—Working capital fund: Appropriates \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

*Weather Bureau*

Amendment No. 91—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$25,500,000, instead of \$26,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$25,069,477 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 92—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$19,500,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

*General provisions—Department of Commerce*

Amendment No. 93: Strike out the language proposed by the Senate making available not to exceed \$5,000 for entertainment of prominent persons, representatives, and dignitaries of foreign governments.

*THE JUDICIARY**Supreme Court of the United States*

Amendment No. 94—Care of the building and grounds: Provides that not to exceed \$147,500 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

*Court of Customs and Patent Appeals*

Amendment No. 95—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$176,715 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

*Customs Court*

Amendment No. 96—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$401,165 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

*Court of Claims*

Amendment No. 97—Salaries and expenses: Provides that not to exceed \$195,580 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

*Other courts and services*

Amendment No. 98—Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates \$750,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$768,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 99—Administrative office of the United States courts: Provides that not to exceed \$488,500 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 100—Expenses of referees: Provides that not to exceed \$800,000 shall be available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

*Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated*

Amendment No. 101: Provides that not to exceed \$263,274 shall be available for personal services for administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 102: Provides that not to exceed \$344,796 shall be available for personal services for expenses of vocational training of prisoners, as proposed by the Senate.

*GENERAL PROVISIONS*

Amendment No. 103—Section 602: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 104—Section 603: Restores the provision of the House, with certain amendments, limiting the filling of vacancies.

Amendment No. 104½—Employees engaged in personnel work: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 105—Limitation on employment of chauffeurs: Inserts the language proposed by the Senate limiting the number of chauffeurs in the District of Columbia as amended to except one half of the number on the rolls as of July 1, 1951.

Amendment No. 106: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate relating to persons engaged in information activities.

Amendment No. 107—Section 606: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 108: Corrects section number.

JOHN J. ROONEY,  
DANIEL J. FLOOD,  
PRINCE H. PRESTON,  
FRED MARSHALL,  
CLARENCE CANNON,  
CLIFF CLEVENGER (except 106),  
JOHN TABER (except to amend 106),  
BEN F. JENSEN (except to amend 106),

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

*COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY*

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit while the House is engaged in general debate tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

*MUTUAL ASSISTANCE BILL REPORT*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the mutual assistance bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

*SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952*

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5650) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5650, with Mr. FORAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, there has been considerable discussion pertaining to the presentation presently before the House. I am addressing myself to the part under consideration, which has to do with military appropriations. I want to say to the gentlemen who have interested themselves in the bill that has to do with appropriations for the dam at the Marine base on the Santa Margarita River in California that when the proper place in the bill is reached, when it is read for amendment, I intend to comply with my commitment to the committee and offer the amendment to give you a chance of removing it from the bill insofar as the dollar value pertains.

Now I should like to address myself to criticism that has developed on two dif-



## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 11, 1951, at 10 o'clock a. m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

865. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

866. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

867. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

868. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases where the ninth proviso to section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), was exercised in behalf of such aliens, pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

869. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Francisco Gomez-Sandoval, file No. A-7828132 CR 35734, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

870. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore-leave purposes only, of alien seamen found to be excludable as persons within one of the classes enumerated in section 1 (2) of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by section 22 of the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

871. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the cases of Carlos Solis or Carlos Solis Avalos, file No. A-7178312 CR 31795 and Carlos Francisco Solis, file No. A-7178313 CR 31795, requesting that they be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

872. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of the orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization granting the application for perma-

nent residence filed by the subjects of such orders, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

873. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of orders of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the act of Congress approved July 1, 1948 (Public Law 863), amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

874. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on co-operation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress for the month of August 1951; to the Committee on Agriculture.

875. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Public Law 25 enacted by the First Guam Legislature, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

876. A letter from the Clerk, United States House of Representatives, transmitting a letter relative to the contest for a seat in the House of Representatives from the Third Congressional District of the State of Pennsylvania, Maurice S. Osser versus Hardie Scott (H. Doc. No. 253); to the Committee on House Administration, and ordered to be printed.

877. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to authorize and validate payments of periodic pay increases for temporary indefinite employees of the Department of the Navy within the period of March 17, 1947 to July 1, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Public Works. S. 1450. An act to provide for the exchange of certain lands owned by the United States of America for certain privately owned lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2131. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Hawaii; with amendment (Rept. No. 1117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3544. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Yellowstone River; with amendment (Rept. No. 1118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. BOSONE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3954. A bill to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4408. A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4799. A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5369. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands located within, and in the vicinity of, the Federal Communications Commission's primary monitoring station, Portland, Ore.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROONEY: Committee of conference. H. R. 4740. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1123). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 5684. A bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 456. Resolution waiving of points of order on H. R. 5684, a bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1125). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 457. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5426, a bill relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1126). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 451. Resolution to amend rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1127). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 5679. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Defense Materials Procurement Agency of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 5680. A bill to amend the act of October 5, 1949 (Public Law 322, 81st Cong.), as amended, so as to extend the time of permits covering lands located on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 5681. A bill for the relief of flood sufferers in designated flood-disaster areas for losses of tangible personal property suffered in the July 1951 floods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 5682. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. IRVING:

H. R. 5683. A bill to amend Public Law No. 875 of the Eighty-first Congress with respect to Federal contributions to States and to lo-



cal governments in connection with disaster expenditures made before the President determines that a major disaster exists; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 5684. A bill making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. J. Res. 344. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 5685. A bill for the relief of Ruml Takemura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 5686. A bill for the relief of Alexander A. Senibaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5687. A bill for the relief of Peter Mihaly Berend; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5688. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James J. O'Rourke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5689. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emma de Sarmezey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 5690. A bill for the relief of the John D. McWilliams Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

455. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted by the New Jersey State Federation of Labor at a mass meeting held in Newark, N. J., on September 29, 1951, calling for stricter price and rent controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

456. By Mr. HART: Petition of New Jersey State American Federation of Labor at a mass demonstration of trades-unionists from 10 counties, and others held in the city of Newark, September 29, 1951, appealing to Congress to alter the present law governing rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

457. Also, resolution of New Jersey State American Federation of Labor at a mass meeting of trades-unionists and other interested consumers from 10 counties of the State held under the auspices of the New Jersey State American Federation of Labor, demanding speedy and favorable congressional action looking toward the repeal of the vi-

cious features of the price-control law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

458. Also, petition of the New Jersey State American Federation of Labor at a mass demonstration of trades unionists from 10 counties of the State of New Jersey, seeking relief for GI families and recontrol of reactivated military and defense areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

459. Also, petition of New Jersey Press Association which unanimously adopted a resolution calling the attention of the United States to awaken the world to the tyranny of Soviet officials of Czechoslovakia and to take every action possible for the release of William N. Oatis, imprisoned representative of the Associated Press; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

460. By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Irwin Aerie No. 1671 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles urging the Federal Government to secure the freedom of William N. Oatis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

461. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Associated Townsend Clubs of Dade County, Bay Front Park, Miami, Fla., vigorously protesting the proposed opening of the welfare rolls to public exposure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

462. Also, petition of James J. Laughlin, attorney, Washington, D. C., relative to impeachment of William C. Coleman, judge, United States District Court for the District of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.











Mr. Sikes with Mr. Ford.  
Mr. Magee with Mr. D'Ewart.

Mr. BONNER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BAKEWELL changed his vote from "nay" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 301, nays 19, answered "present" 1, not voting 107, as follows:

[Roll No. 198]

YEAS—301

|                  |                |                |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Abbt             | Cunningham     | Jarman         |
| Abernethy        | Curtis, Nebr.  | Javits         |
| Adair            | Davis, Tenn.   | Jenkins        |
| Addonizio        | Davis, Wis.    | Jones, Ala.    |
| Albert           | Dawson         | Jones, Mo.     |
| Allen, Calif.    | DeGraffenried  | Jones,         |
| Allen, Ill.      | Denny          | Hamilton C.    |
| Andersen,        | Devereux       | Jones,         |
| H. Carl          | Dingell        | Woodrow W.     |
| Anderson, Calif. | Dollinger      | Judd           |
| Andrews          | Dolliver       | Karsten, Mo.   |
| Angell           | Dondero        | Kean           |
| Arends           | Donohue        | Kearns         |
| Armstrong        | Doughton       | Keating        |
| Aspinall         | Doyle          | Kee            |
| Auchincloss      | Durham         | Kelley, Pa.    |
| Ayres            | Eaton          | Kerr           |
| Bailey           | Elliott        | Kersten, Wis.  |
| Bakewell         | Ellsworth      | Kilday         |
| Barden           | Engle          | King           |
| Barrett          | Evins          | Kirwan         |
| Bates, Mass.     | Fallon         | Kluczynski     |
| Battle           | Feighan        | Lane           |
| Beall            | Fernandez      | Lanham         |
| Beamer           | Fisher         | Lantaff        |
| Beckworth        | Flood          | LeCompte       |
| Bender           | Forand         | Lesinski       |
| Bennett, Fla.    | Forrester      | Lind           |
| Bennett, Mich.   | Fugate         | Lovre          |
| Bentsen          | Fulton         | Lyle           |
| Berry            | Furcolo        | McCarthy       |
| Betts            | Garmatz        | McConnell      |
| Bishop           | Gary           | McCormack      |
| Boggs, Del.      | George         | McGregor       |
| Bolling          | Golden         | McGuire        |
| Bolton           | Gordon         | McKinnon       |
| Bonner           | Graham         | McMillan       |
| Bosone           | Granahan       | McMullen       |
| Bow              | Granger        | Machrowicz     |
| Boykin           | Grant          | Mack, Wash.    |
| Brehm            | Green          | Madden         |
| Brown, Ga.       | Greenwood      | Mahon          |
| Brownson         | Hagen          | Mansfield      |
| Bryson           | Hale           | Marshall       |
| Buchanan         | Hall           | Martin, Iowa   |
| Buckley          | Edwin Arthur   | Martin, Mass.  |
| Budge            | Halleck        | Meador         |
| Burdick          | Hand           | Merrow         |
| Burnside         | Harden         | Miller, Md.    |
| Burton           | Hardy          | Miller, Nebr.  |
| Camp             | Harris         | Miller, N. Y.  |
| Canfield         | Harrison, Va.  | Mills          |
| Cannon           | Harrison, Wyo. | Mitchell       |
| Carlyle          | Hart           | Morano         |
| Carnahan         | Harvey         | Morgan         |
| Case             | Havener        | Morris         |
| Chatham          | Hays, Ark.     | Moulder        |
| Chelf            | Hays, Ohio     | Murdock        |
| Chenoweth        | Hedrick        | Murray, Tenn.  |
| Chiperfield      | Herlong        | Nelson         |
| Chudoff          | Hertel         | Nicholson      |
| Church           | Hegleton       | Norblad        |
| Clemente         | Hill           | Norrell        |
| Clevenger        | Hillings       | O'Brien, Ill.  |
| Cole, Kans.      | Hinshaw        | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Colmer           | Hoeven         | O'Hara         |
| Cooley           | Holmes         | O'Neill        |
| Cooper           | Hope           | Ostertag       |
| Corbett          | Horan          | O'Toole        |
| Cotton           | Hunter         | Passman        |
| Coudert          | Ikard          | Patman         |
| Cox              | Irving         | Patten         |
| Crosser          | Jackson, Wash. | Patterson      |
| Crumpacker       | James          | Philbin        |

Pickett  
Polk  
Poulson  
Preston  
Price  
Priest  
Prouty  
Rabaut  
Radwan  
Rains  
Rankin  
Reams  
Reece, Tenn.  
Rees, Kans.  
Rhodes  
Richards  
Riehlman  
Riley  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Robeson  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Mass.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rooney  
Sabath  
Sadlak  
St. George

Sasscer  
Saylor  
Scott, Hardie  
Scott,  
Price  
Hugh D., Jr.  
Scrivner  
Scudder  
Secrest  
Seely-Brown  
Shafer  
Sheppard  
Short  
Sieminski  
Simpson, Ill.  
Simpson, Pa.  
Sittler  
Smith, Miss.  
Smith, Va.  
Spence  
Springer  
Stanley  
Steed  
Stigler  
Sutton  
Taber  
Tackett  
Talle  
Teague  
Thomas

Thompson,  
Mich.  
Tollefson  
Trimble  
Van Zandt  
Vursell  
Walter  
Watts  
Welch  
Welch  
Wheeler  
Whitaker  
Whitten  
Widnall  
Wier  
Wigglesworth  
Williams, Miss.  
Williams, N. Y.  
Willis  
Wilson, Tex.  
Winstead  
Withrow  
Wolcott  
Wood, Ga.  
Woodruff  
Yorty  
Zablocki

Mr. Yates with Mr. Stockman.  
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Gwinn.  
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Potter.  
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Morton.  
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Cole of New York.  
Mr. Thornberry with Mr. Baker.  
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Kearney.  
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Latham.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Velde.  
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Wolverton.  
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Wood of Idaho.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Werdel.  
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Fenton.  
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Gamble.  
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Hess.  
Mr. Regan with Mr. Phillips.  
Mr. Redden with Mr. Crawford.  
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Butler.  
Mr. Flood with Mr. Busbey.  
Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Brown of Ohio.  
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. McCulloch.  
Mr. Rodino with Mr. McDonough.  
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Elston.  
Mr. Howell with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.  
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Bramblett.  
Mr. Denton with Mr. August H. Andresen.  
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. D'Ewart.

Mr. VURSELL changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. BYRNES. If he were present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a special order was granted whereby the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] would be recognized for 1 hour today in connection with remarks relating to General Pulaski. The gentleman from Michigan is, of course, very busily engaged in the conference on the tax bill. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON] be substituted for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] in control of the time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5215) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. CANNON, THOMAS, WHITTEN, TABER, and DAVIS of Wisconsin.

#### STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4750) making appropriations for the De-

#### NAYS—19

|                |             |              |
|----------------|-------------|--------------|
| Buffett        | Jensen      | Smith, Kans. |
| Bush           | Jonas       | Vall         |
| Curtis, Mo.    | McVey       | Van Pelt     |
| Gross          | Mason       | Wharton      |
| Hoffman, Mich. | Mumma       | Wilson, Ind. |
| Hull           | Reed, N. Y. |              |
| Jenison        | Schwabe     |              |

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Smith, Wis.

#### NOT VOTING—107

|              |                 |                |
|--------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Aandahl      | Fine            | Morrison       |
| Allen, La.   | Fogarty         | Morton         |
| Andersen,    | Ford            | Multer         |
| August H.    | Frazier         | Murphy         |
| Anfuso       | Gamble          | Murray, Wis.   |
| Baker        | Gathings        | O'Konski       |
| Baring       | Gavin           | Perkins        |
| Bates, Ky.   | Goodwin         | Phillips       |
| Belcher      | Gore            | Poage          |
| Blackney     | Gregory         | Potter         |
| Blatnik      | Gwinn           | Powell         |
| Boggs, La.   | Hall            | Quinn          |
| Bramblett    | Leonard W.      | Ramsay         |
| Bray         | Hébert          | Redden         |
| Brooks       | Heffernan       | Reed, Ill.     |
| Brown, Ohio  | Heller          | Regan          |
| Burleson     | Hess            | Ribicoff       |
| Busbey       | Hoffman, Ill.   | Rodino         |
| Butler       | Holifield       | Roosevelt      |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Howell          | Sheehan        |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Jackson, Calif. | Shelley        |
| Celler       | Johnson         | Sikes          |
| Cole, N. Y.  | Kearney         | Staggers       |
| Combs        | Kelly, N. Y.    | Stockman       |
| Crawford     | Kennedy         | Taylor         |
| Dague        | Keogh           | Thompson, Tex. |
| Davis, Ga.   | Kilburn         | Thornberry     |
| Deane        | Klein           | Velde          |
| Delaney      | Larcade         | Vinson         |
| Dempsey      | Latham          | Vorys          |
| Denton       | Lucas           | Werdel         |
| D'Ewart      | McCulloch       | Wickersham     |
| Donovan      | McDonough       | Wolverton      |
| Dorn         | McGrath         | Wood, Idaho    |
| Eberharter   | Mack, Ill.      | Yates          |
| Elston       | Magee           |                |
| Fenton       | Miller, Calif.  |                |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.  
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Goodwin.  
Mr. Baring with Mr. Gavin.  
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Dague.  
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Reed of Illinois.  
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Sheehan.  
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Taylor.  
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Magee with Mr. Blackney.  
Mr. Deane with Mr. Kilburn.



partments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. ROONEY (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, October 10, 1951.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the pending conference report—

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield me some time so that I may have an opportunity to discuss the conference report.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall gladly yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, in this conference report, the House conferees have seen fit to fail to agree with the Senate on the inclusion of an item of nearly \$600,000 for the testing of jet-type aircraft. That item was deleted from the House bill by this subcommittee before the bill came to the House in the first instance. I think the subcommittee on further consideration will want to put this item in on a later date, if for no other reason than that it means another year's delay to our own industry in catching up with the British in the development of jet-type aircraft for transport purposes. The British are now so far ahead of us by virtue of the fact that no one seems to be able, or willing, to test these vehicles sufficiently far to obtain certification by the Civil Aeronautics Board so that none of them are being flown in the United States. In the meantime, the British are going ahead very rapidly to develop this type of aircraft, and capture the markets of the world from the manufacturers of the United States. I hope the gentleman will see fit through his subcommittee to agree to that expenditure in due course. It has been recommended by every agency of the Government, and practically all of the private agencies.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true a recently captured Russian aircraft was found to have better jet engines and better heat-resistant material in it than our engineers thus far have been able to develop?

Mr. HINSHAW. That may be, but that is really not a part of this business. It is a very important item, but nevertheless it does not come into this business I am discussing.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; but adequate testing would help us to develop needed improvements.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman from New York will yield me a minute extra, if necessary, I would like to ask him a question.

Mr. ROONEY. How can I refuse my good friend? I shall gladly do so.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does not the gentleman from New York think it is important for American industry to at least maintain a parity with the British in the development of this type of aircraft?

Mr. ROONEY. I certainly do, and I would like to see the American aircraft industry and commercial airlines spend some money of their own in research development and testing. The proposition submitted to this committee with regard to turbo-jet testing was, in the opinion of this committee, and I believe I can speak the thoughts of all of us, both the minority and the majority, utterly ridiculous. The department proposed to use an Army jet bomber, a B-45, for the purpose of testing whether or not such jet aircraft would be suitable for private transport. We have been informed by people in the industry in whose judgment we have great confidence that such would be nothing more than a boondoggling job. Further, the military already have a fabulous sum for testing jets.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to say that jet type aircraft in transport service are not now acceptable for flying in patterns around civil airports because of the exceedingly high speed which it is necessary for them to maintain. They would constitute serious hazards to the slower types of transport now in use. It is necessary to develop new procedures in air traffic control to accommodate jets in traffic patterns around congested airports, such as LaGuardia in New York. It may be necessary to develop new aids to traffic controllers and perhaps new aids to navigation. The \$600,000 requested is for conducting flights of jet aircraft in simulated transport service. For that purpose the Air Force will make available two B-47's. For that purpose B-47's are just as useful as the jet transport—of which we as yet have none. This testing is only indirectly, although importantly, related to the manufacture of jet transports and certainly no airline can afford to buy airplanes that may not be certificated for use within a short period of time. Testing of jets in simulated transport service is the first step to take, but this subcommittee fails to see the critical importance of this \$600,000 item.

I think it is very important, and I want to appear before the gentleman's committee the next time they hold a hearing on this matter.

Mr. ROONEY. We shall be glad to hear the gentleman and shall highly respect his observations.

Mr. HINSHAW. The Civil Aeronautics Administration cannot certificate such a vehicle, be it a bomber or otherwise, until they find out what the characteristics of it are in flight in and about the major airports in the United States. Somebody will be killed if they do not

find out in advance how these planes will act. No manufacturer can afford to put up the necessary \$25,000,000 in order to develop such an aircraft until something is known about its flight characteristics in and about airports. I thank the gentleman for the privilege of attending his committee when it meets on this subject, and I hope he will give me a little advance notice so that I may be prepared.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. We have provided upward of \$600,000,000 in the armed services bill for the testing of jet engines, including those that may be used in transport operations for the military. It seems to me that would cover the matter.

Mr. HINSHAW. In fact it does not, although I appreciate the gentleman's point of view in the matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the next gentleman, may I say that insofar as this conference report is concerned the budget estimates for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and for the Federal Judiciary were in the amount of \$1,258,296,141. When the bill passed the House the amount appropriated therein was \$1,045,940,115. The bill as passed by the Senate contained appropriations in the amount of \$1,045,452,863. We today bring you a conference report which provides appropriations which are about two and one-half million dollars less than either the House bill or the Senate bill, and which are \$215,428,254 lower than the amount of the budget estimates for the three Departments and the Judiciary.

The following is a breakdown of the figures to which I have just referred:

| <i>Budget estimates</i> |                  |
|-------------------------|------------------|
| State.....              | \$283, 686, 476  |
| Justice.....            | 184, 356, 000    |
| Commerce.....           | 763, 763, 925    |
| Judiciary.....          | 26, 469, 740     |
| Total.....              | 1, 258, 296, 141 |
| <i>Passed House</i>     |                  |
| State.....              | \$226, 357, 000  |
| Justice.....            | 181, 567, 000    |
| Commerce.....           | 612, 098, 000    |
| Judiciary.....          | 25, 918, 115     |
| Total.....              | 1, 045, 940, 115 |
| <i>Passed Senate</i>    |                  |
| State.....              | \$227, 877, 838  |
| Justice.....            | 182, 137, 600    |
| Commerce.....           | 609, 500, 560    |
| Judiciary.....          | 25, 936, 865     |
| Total.....              | 1, 045, 452, 863 |
| <i>Conference</i>       |                  |
| State.....              | \$228, 104, 861  |
| Justice.....            | 181, 602, 000    |
| Commerce.....           | 607, 242, 911    |
| Judiciary.....          | 25, 918, 115     |
| Total.....              | 1, 042, 867, 887 |

Mr. Speaker, I must call attention to a very important amendment referred to in the conference report as Senate



amendment numbered 106. Inserted by the Senate, it would have provided for the reduction of the information activities of the Department of State to the extent of 25 percent. The majority of the House and Senate conferees voted that the Senate recede from its amendment which would also have affected the Departments of Justice and Commerce. The importance of the elimination of this Senate amendment is referred to in the following letter of the President of the United States dated September 24, 1951:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, September 24, 1951.  
Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROONEY: I am writing to you and Senator McCARRAN to call your attention to a matter which, in my opinion, is of great importance in this time of national crisis.

I should like to urge strongly that the Senate amendment to the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations bill (H. R. 4740), which would reduce the information activities of these three agencies by 25 percent, be eliminated or revised. The effect of this amendment would be particularly harmful in the case of the Department of State.

It would seriously cripple the activities of the Office of Public Affairs of that Department. It is the function of this office to supply the American people with factual information on the nature of the world situation and this Nation's part in it. The Office of Public Affairs is the main source of contact between nearly 500 national organizations and the Department of State. Scores of requests from patriotic, military, religious, labor, and agricultural organizations are handled by this office every day. It answers thousands of letters a year from individual citizens who have written to their Government on vital issues of foreign policy. Many of these letters have been referred to the Department by Members of the Congress. The Office of Public Affairs prepares popular pamphlets, leaflets, and other publications for distribution to the public, to school and college students, and to Members of Congress who want to send current information on foreign policy to their constituents. Far from being a propaganda operation as some of its opponents have charged, the State Department's public liaison activities are a service operation set up to fill the legitimate requests of our people for information about foreign affairs.

The Office of Public Affairs also helps to keep officials in the executive branch informed about public opinion on foreign policy issues. Mail from the public, editorials, magazine articles, and radio comments are analyzed and this information is relayed promptly to key officials throughout the Government. If our foreign policy is to be responsive to the will of the American people, and if our officials are to know what the people want, it is imperative that the Government maintain a channel such as the Office of Public Affairs for two-way communication with the public.

I might note that the Hoover Commission commended this operation and recommended its expansion, rather than its contraction.

I understand that the House and Senate conferees are meeting today to discuss the different versions of this bill. I am of the opinion that these vital public information activities of the Department of State should be continued. It would be tragic if the day-to-day operations of our foreign policy were to be carried on in the dark, with our people

poorly informed about matters of such vital importance to them.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

The recommendations of the so-called Hoover Commission referred to in the President's letter are contained in the Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Foreign Affairs—appendix II, pages 74, 80–81 January 1949—and read as follows:

Two additional major responsibilities have also been added to those of the prewar era. One is the responsibility for a large share of the integration and coordination of foreign policy formulation and execution through interdepartmental committees and other interdepartmental arrangements. The other is the responsibility for furnishing to the American public and peoples of foreign countries information as to the nature and purposes of the United States objectives and policies in the world of today. Providing information to the American public is a recognition that with our new position in the world the support of an informed public is essential, as was amply demonstrated in 1945 in the case of the United Nations charter and again in 1947–48 in that of the Marshall plan. Similarly, furnishing information to foreign peoples through radio (the Voice of America), publications and motion pictures may be an important ingredient of an effective foreign policy.

The broad democratic basis upon which the United States must conduct its foreign affairs today makes American public opinion a vital factor both in the determination of fundamental objectives and in the formulation and execution of policy. Whereas in Great Britain foreign affairs have long been of intimate concern to the British public, the State Department for a long period worked in a relatively quiet cove unaffected by public sentiment. Today it is forced not only to ascertain what American public opinion is but also to win its acceptance and support. Furthermore, it has found that the opinion of the peoples of foreign countries, as contrasted with their governments, also bears upon the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States. \* \* \*

The public opinion problem is twofold in nature. First, it requires the State Department to ascertain the status of American and foreign public attitudes and to use public opinion data as one of the factors in policy determination. Second, it requires the State Department to make its own position known to the public so as to gain acceptance and support.

In the former instance the Office of Public Affairs seeks to tap and evaluate American public opinion. Summaries of public opinion developments drawn from press and radio sources are regularly prepared and circulated within the State Department and to the missions overseas. Data from public-opinion polls are utilized and on occasion special surveys are made of public opinion on particular subjects. In general this machinery seems to be adequate for ascertaining American public attitudes. But while the top command is interested in the data produced, the present mechanism is not adequate to insure that such data will be regularly employed as one of the factors in top command policy machinery.

In the second respect, that of the State Department's making its position known to the public, liaison is maintained with many private organizations, speakers are sent out to private groups, letters and inquiries are handled, and a considerable body of material on foreign relations is made available through the State Department Bulletin and

other publications. On the whole, however, it appears that this process has not been as fully developed as is desirable.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the committee feels that it has returned to the House with a fine conference report, one that should be speedily adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to bring to the attention of the committee officially a matter about which a constituent has written me.

It is the old story which we have heard before from other Government departments and agencies, but I feel it is of sufficient importance that it should engage our attention.

An estimable and reliable constituent has written me that she has heard from her daughter who is married to a Foreign Service officer in Soerabaja, Indonesia. The daughter writes her as follows:

Congress has cut down appropriations for the State Department. Do you know how this affects us? Our typhus and typhoid shots are several weeks overdue, because there are no appropriations yet to cover the money for doctor and nurse to come from Jakarta. We will have to start the whole series over again. I hope they don't have to pay hospital expenses instead.

Then my constituent very naturally adds:

Don't you think this is a pretty poor place to start economizing? I am bringing this to your attention in hopes there is something you can do to remedy this situation.

This reaction is not at all surprising. It represents the resentment understandably felt by a mother which would be thoroughly justified if it were a fact that a cut of a couple of million dollars in a seventy-five million appropriation were the cause of denying proper medical attention to her loved ones.

This is a repetition of the sort of situation we are constantly encountering. Of course, it is utterly ridiculous for the Foreign Service post in the field to lay at the door of Congress its failure to provide necessary inoculations for its personnel. But they must have some whipping boy to cover up their lack of planning. They must say something to their loyal people who are conscientiously serving in the jungles and remote areas of the world. So they pick on the Congress of the United States.

We, as Members, have experienced this same excuse so often that it is an old story. But it causes deep and natural concern among those unfamiliar with the trick. It is as old as bureaucracy itself. But I would feel remiss in my responsibilities were I not to bring this specific case forcibly and officially to the attention of the Appropriations Committee.

I have written the Secretary of State and received a reply that—

The Department of State is not aware of any curtailment of medical facilities or travel funds for the medical staff in Indonesia. However, we are requesting the embassy in Djakarta to make a thorough investigation



of the conditions set forth in your letter and to inform the Department immediately of its findings.

Following the usual pattern, the Department will undoubtedly advise me in due course that it was all due to a "misunderstanding."

But we must try to devise better means of preventing such efforts on the part of Government agencies to bring improper pressure to bear upon the Members of Congress who are attempting to discharge their duty to protect the taxpayers against extravagances in spending.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, that is all nonsense. All they would have to do to economize would be, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has told us, to cut down on their liquor bill; they have plenty of money.

Mr. KEATING. That is certainly one place where it would be wiser to practice economy and there are many others. Certainly one place where the Congress definitely did not intend they should curtail their activities was in the field of protecting the health of those stationed in disease-infested areas.

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include a letter and other extraneous material.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the result of this conference with a figure below what either House had provided is generally satisfactory. There is, however, one amendment that the Senate put in, No. 106, that I and some others felt should be adopted because it would reduce the information personnel very substantially and effectively, and improve the tone of their service. I hope that maybe the next time something of that kind can happen.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 79: Page 45, line 6, insert:

"Public Lands Highways: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the act of September 7, 1950, \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,125,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 103: Page 63, line 18, strike out section 602 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 602. No representative of the United States Government in any international organization hereafter shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33 1/3 percent of the budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States in excess of 33 1/3 percent of the budget, a commitment requiring a United States appropriation of a larger proportion may be made after consultation by United States representatives in the organization or other appropriate officials of the Department of State with the Committees on Appropriation of the Senate and House of Representatives: *Provided*, however, That this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the Inter-American organizations."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 602. No representative of the United States Government in any international organization hereafter shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33 1/3 per centum of the budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States in excess of 33 1/3 per centum of the budget, a commitment requiring a United States appropriation of a larger proportion may be made after consultation by United States representatives in the organization or other appropriate officials of the Department of State with the Committees on Appropriation of the Senate and House of Representatives: *Provided*, however, That this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the Inter-American organizations."

"No representative of the United States Government to any international organization of which the United States is not now a member shall, unless specifically authorized in an appropriation act or other law, make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33 1/3 per centum of the budget of such international organization."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the language proposed by the conference committee is substitute language for that written into this bill by the House under an amendment which I offered, which reads as follows:

None of the funds appropriated in this act—

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. May I point out that the Senate wrote in all of the language except the second or last paragraph beginning "No representative of the United States Government," and so forth. This last paragraph was written into the bill by the conferees, and the entire language then adopted unanimously by the conferees on the part of both the House and Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I apologize to the gentleman for my oversight; however, it is substitute language, in effect, written in by the Senate for the language which the House put in the bill. I shall read the House language:

None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be used to pay an assessment to any international organization which exceeds one-third of the total annual cost thereof.

The language which was written in by the House on an amendment which I offered, and which carried on a teller vote 155 to 137, provided for a limitation on the funds appropriated in this specific act. The substitute language or the language of the Senate amendment as agreed to by the conferees provides for a limitation on funds that are hereafter appropriated, and, as far as I can tell from the language in the Senate amendment, it does not actually permit a cut in these funds, and it has no force or effect because it leaves wide open loopholes. It says:

*Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States in excess of 33 1/3 percent of the budget, a commitment requiring a United States appropriation of a larger proportion may be made after consultation by United States representatives in the organization or other appropriate officials of the Department of State with the Committees on Appropriation of the Senate and House of Representatives.

In my opinion, what this language says is that we shall limit our contributions to these organizations hereafter—not applying to this particular bill, but to future appropriation bills; that the House shall give the Appropriations Committee, the Department of State, and our representatives in the United Nations Organization legislative authority to bind the United States Congress in the future.

I would have no objection to the amendment that has been placed there, I presume by the conference committee, wherein it states that "this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the inter-American organizations."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I would not in the least object to that and I do not think any Member of the House would under the circumstances; but, in my opinion, we should limit the funds appropriated in this bill under the amendment which was offered and accepted by the House.

Of the two, the House limitation is the only one that has any teeth in it.



Mr. ROONEY. May I say with regard to this item that the language which is now being considered by the House is the unanimous language of the conferees on the part of both the House and Senate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There are several inter-American agreements with reference to lighthouses and that sort of thing where we have to go 50 percent. We would expect to do that in the future. This was the best language that we could get out of the Senate, everything considered.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, may I point out that the conference on this bill took five sessions and covered a period of 17 days. There was a great deal of thought given by the conferees to each of the items in disagreement, and the one now under consideration took quite a bit of the time of the conferees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" had it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-six Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 200, nays 126, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 199]  
YEAS—200

|                  |               |                |
|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abbitt           | Carlyle       | Forand         |
| Addonizio        | Carnahan      | Fugate         |
| Albert           | Case          | Fulton         |
| Allen, Calif.    | Chatham       | Garmatz        |
| Anderson, Calif. | Chelf         | Gary           |
| Andrews          | Chodoff       | Gordon         |
| Angell           | Clemente      | Granahan       |
| Aspinall         | Clevenger     | Granger        |
| Bailey           | Cole, Kans.   | Grant          |
| Bakewell         | Cooley        | Green          |
| Barden           | Cooper        | Greenwood      |
| Barrett          | Corbett       | Gwinn          |
| Bates, Mass.     | Cotton        | Hale           |
| Battle           | Coudert       | Hall           |
| Beckworth        | Cox           | Edwin Arthur   |
| Bender           | Crosser       | Hardy          |
| Bennett, Fla.    | Davis, Tenn.  | Harris         |
| Bentsen          | Dawson        | Harrison, Va.  |
| Boggs, Del.      | DeGraffenried | Hart           |
| Bolling          | Dingell       | Havener        |
| Bolton           | Dollinger     | Hays, Ark.     |
| Bonner           | Donohue       | Hedrick        |
| Bosone           | Doughton      | Herlong        |
| Boykin           | Doyle         | Herter         |
| Brown, Ga.       | Durham        | Heseltan       |
| Bryson           | Eaton         | Holmes         |
| Buchanan         | Elliott       | Ikard          |
| Buckley          | Engle         | Irving         |
| Burnside         | Evins         | Jackson, Wash. |
| Burton           | Fallon        | Jarman         |
| Camp             | Feighan       | Javits         |
| Canfield         | Fernandez     | Jenkins        |
| Cannon           | Fine          | Jones, Ala.    |

|               |                |               |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Jones, Mo.    | Moulder        | Sasscer       |
| Jones         | Multer         | Scott, Hardie |
| Hamilton C.   | Murdock        | Scott         |
| Jones         | Norblad        | Hugh D., Jr.  |
| Woodrow W.    | Norrell        | Scrivner      |
| Judd          | O'Brien, Ill.  | Secrest       |
| Karsten, Mo.  | O'Brien, Mich. | Seely-Brown   |
| Keating       | O'Neill        | Sheppard      |
| Kee           | O'Toole        | Sieminski     |
| Kelley, Pa.   | Passman        | Smith, Miss.  |
| Kersten, Wis. | Patman         | Smith, Va.    |
| Kilday        | Patten         | Spence        |
| King          | Philbin        | Staggers      |
| Kirwan        | Polk           | Stanley       |
| Klein         | Preston        | Steed         |
| Kluczynski    | Price          | Stigler       |
| Lane          | Priest         | Stockman      |
| Lanham        | Prouty         | Sutton        |
| Lantaff       | Rabaut         | Taber         |
| Lesinski      | Rains          | Teague        |
| Lind          | Ramsay         | Thomas        |
| Lyle          | Reams          | Tollefson     |
| McCarthy      | Rhodes         | Trimble       |
| McCormack     | Richards       | Walter        |
| McGuire       | Riley          | Watts         |
| McMillan      | Rivers         | Welch         |
| McMullen      | Roberts        | Whitaker      |
| Mansfield     | Robeson        | Wickersham    |
| Marshall      | Rodino         | Widnall       |
| Marrow        | Rogers, Colo.  | Wier          |
| Mills         | Rogers, Fla.   | Wigglesworth  |
| Mitchell      | Rogers, Tex.   | Willis        |
| Morano        | Rooney         | Wolcott       |
| Morgan        | Sabath         | Yorty         |
| Morris        | Sadlak         | Zablocki      |

NAYS—126

|                |                |                 |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Aandahl        | Gross          | Potter          |
| Abernethy      | Hagen          | Poulson         |
| Adair          | Halleck        | Radwan          |
| Allen, Ill.    | Hand           | Rankin          |
| Andersen       | Harden         | Reece, Tenn.    |
| H. Carl        | Harrison, Wyo. | Reed, N. Y.     |
| Arends         | Harvey         | Rees, Kans.     |
| Armstrong      | Hays, Ohio     | Riehlman        |
| Auchincloss    | Hill           | Rogers, Mass.   |
| Ayres          | Hillings       | St. George      |
| Beall          | Hinshaw        | Saylor          |
| Beamer         | Hoeven         | Schwabe         |
| Bennett, Mich. | Hoffman, Mich. | Scudder         |
| Berry          | Horan          | Shafer          |
| Betts          | Hull           | Short           |
| Bishop         | Hunter         | Simpson, Ill.   |
| Bow            | James          | Simpson, Pa.    |
| Bray           | Jenison        | Sittler         |
| Brehm          | Jensen         | Smith, Kans.    |
| Brownson       | Jonas          | Smith, Wis.     |
| Budge          | Kean           | Springer        |
| Buffett        | Kearns         | Tackett         |
| Burdick        | LeCompte       | Talle           |
| Bush           | Lovre          | Thompson, Mich. |
| Chenoweth      | McConnell      | Vail            |
| Chiperfield    | McGregor       | Van Pelt        |
| Church         | McVey          | Van Zandt       |
| Colmer         | Mack, Wash.    | Velde           |
| Crumpacker     | Martin, Iowa   | Vursell         |
| Cunningham     | Martin, Mass.  | Welch           |
| Curtis, Mo.    | Mason          | Wharton         |
| Curtis, Nebr.  | Meador         | Wheeler         |
| Davis, Ga.     | Miller, Md.    | Whitten         |
| Davis, Wis.    | Miller, Nebr.  | Williams, Miss. |
| Denny          | Miller, N. Y.  | Williams, N. Y. |
| Devereux       | Mumma          | Wilson, Ind.    |
| Dolliver       | Murray, Tenn.  | Wilson, Tex.    |
| Ellsworth      | Nelson         | Winstead        |
| Fisher         | Nicholson      | Withrow         |
| Forrester      | O'Hara         | Wood, Ga.       |
| George         | Ostertag       | Woodruff        |
| Golden         | Patterson      |                 |
| Graham         | Pickett        |                 |

NOT VOTING—102

|              |            |                 |
|--------------|------------|-----------------|
| Allen, La.   | Combs      | Gavin           |
| Andresen     | Crawford   | Goodwin         |
| August H.    | Dague      | Gore            |
| Anfuso       | Deane      | Gregory         |
| Baker        | Delaney    | Hall            |
| Baring       | Dempsey    | Leonard W.      |
| Bates, Ky.   | Denton     | Hébert          |
| Belcher      | D'Ewart    | Heffernan       |
| Blackney     | Dondero    | Heller          |
| Blatnik      | Donovan    | Hess            |
| Boggs, La.   | Dorn       | Hoffman, Ill.   |
| Bramblett    | Eberharter | Hollfield       |
| Brooks       | Elston     | Hope            |
| Brown, Ohio  | Fenton     | Howell          |
| Burleson     | Flood      | Jackson, Calif. |
| Busbey       | Fogarty    | Johnson         |
| Butler       | Ford       | Kearney         |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Frazier    | Kelly, N. Y.    |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Furcolo    | Kennedy         |
| Celler       | Gamble     | Keogh           |
| Cole, N. Y.  | Gathings   | Kerr            |

|                |              |                |
|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Kilburn        | Morrison     | Roosevelt      |
| Larcade        | Morton       | Sheehan        |
| Latham         | Murphy       | Shelley        |
| Lucas          | Murray, Wis. | Sikes          |
| McCulloch      | O'Konski     | Taylor         |
| McDonough      | Perkins      | Thompson, Tex. |
| McGrath        | Phillips     | Thornberry     |
| McKinnon       | Poage        | Vinson         |
| Machrowicz     | Powell       | Vorys          |
| Mack, Ill.     | Quinn        | Werdel         |
| Madden         | Redden       | Wolverton      |
| Magee          | Reed, Ill.   | Wood, Idaho    |
| Mahon          | Regan        | Yates          |
| Miller, Calif. | Ribicoff     |                |

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Butler against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Hess against.

Mrs. Kelly of New York for, with Mr. Werdel against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky for, with Mr. Latham against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Sheehan against.

Mr. Gregory for, with Mr. Wolverton against.

Mr. McGrath for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Donovan for, with Mr. Dague against.

Mr. Hollifield for, with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Mack of Illinois for, with Mr. McDonough against.

Mr. Yates for, with Mr. Phillips against.

Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.

Mr. Denton for, with Mr. Busbey against.

Mr. Magee for, with Mr. Cole of New York against.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana for, with Mr. Morton against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Baker against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Wood of Idaho against.

Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. August H. Andresen against.

Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Redden for, with Mr. Goodwin against.

Mr. Murphy for, with Mr. Fenton against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Gamble against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Crawford against.

Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Hope against.

Mr. Ribicoff for, with Mr. Kearney against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Machrowicz for, with Mr. Elston against.

Mr. Kerr for, with Mr. Dondero against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Belcher against.

Mr. Deane for, with Mr. D'Ewart against.

Mr. Dempsey for, with Mr. Bramblett against.

Mr. Eberharter for, with Mr. Regan against.

Mr. Flood for, with Mr. Johnson against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Vorys.

Mr. McKinnon with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Ford.

MESSRS. ALLEN of Illinois, CHENOWETH, and TACKETT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

MESSRS. MERROW and DAWSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.



The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 104½: Page 65, line 11, insert the following:

"SEC. 603. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to personnel work concerning employees of the Foreign Service of the United States."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104½, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 604. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That excess factors arising from unusual requirements approved by the President may be used in applying a different ratio, but in no instance shall the number be in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to 85, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to personnel work concerning employees of the Foreign Service of the United States."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the amendment just read by the Clerk represents the unanimous agreement of the managers both on the part of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 107: Page 67, line 21, insert the following:

"SEC. 606. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classifi-

cation Act of 1949 to place two positions in grade GS-18, and seven positions in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be in lieu of any positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation previously allocated under section 505. The compensation of the Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation hereafter shall be \$17,500 per annum.

"The Secretary of State hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place one additional position in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949.

"The Secretary of Commerce hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place one additional position in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 606. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place two positions in grade GS-18, and seven positions in grade GS-17, in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be in lieu of any positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation previously allocated under section 505. The compensation of the Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation hereafter shall be \$17,500 per annum.

"The Secretary of State hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of Director, Office of Budget and Finance in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

"The Secretary of Commerce hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of Director, Office of Budget and Management in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

#### PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar on Tuesday next be dispensed with and that it may be in order for the Private Calendar to be called on Thursday next. There are only two bills on the Private Calendar at the present time and the Committee on the Judiciary is now reporting out some more private bills, so it would be better to call the Private Calendar on Thursday rather than on Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, this probably will be the last call for the Private Calendar in this session?

Mr. McCORMACK. I sincerely hope so. I shall do everything I can to accomplish that much desired result.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman's strength will be redoubled.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On October 3, 1951:

H. R. 711. An act for the relief of George Lukes; and

H. R. 4463. An act for the relief of Nadine Carol Heslip.

On October 9, 1951:

H. R. 662. An act for the relief of William O. Stevens;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Chow Hsia and her son, Sven Erik Hsia;

H. R. 804. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria DeRubertis, Agnese Cerina, Marianna Bonifacio, Dina Bonini, and Edvige Gasparini;

H. R. 1123. An act for the relief of Harvey McFarland and Laurance Anthony Warnock;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of David Lee Harrigan;

H. R. 3818. An act for the relief of Yutaka Nakaeda;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of five sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary; and

H. R. 4633. An act for the relief of Cecelia Wahls.

On October 10, 1951:

H. R. 579. An act for the relief of Hendryk Kempinski;

H. R. 580. An act for the relief of Kwang Myeng Chu;

H. R. 901. An act to provide for the admission of Janet and Daisy Wong to the United States;

H. R. 1102. An act for the relief of Emilio Torres;

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyl) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta);

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer;

H. R. 1816. An act for the relief of Shoemon Takano;

H. R. 1818. An act for the relief of Hego Fuchino;

H. R. 2165. An act for the relief of Matthew Terry;

H. R. 2444. An act for the relief of James A. Vines;

H. R. 2498. An act for the relief of Marianne and Michel Speelman;

H. R. 2621. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giulia Di Gaetano Coccia;

H. R. 2745. An act to amend section 2801 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 2807. An act for the relief of Stanislaw Poborski;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Shizu Torachi Parks;

H. R. 3436. An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport grain between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1951;

H. R. 3585. An act to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to











Another area of service which would be completely disrupted by the amendment would be the Air Reserve and Air National Guard. Our Reserves are now expected to fly about 1 week end per month to maintain their proficiency. To meet a requirement of 20 hours per month would require our reservists to fly at least every week end per month, which is not only unreasonable but aircraft and facilities are not available to support such a program.

The impression created during the Senate debate is unfortunate and is having a disturbing effect. Allegations of corruption and abuses were made, yet no specific charges or incidents were cited. Not only does the Air Force scrupulously comply with the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 and Executive Order No. 10152 of August 1950, but it imposes substantially increased requirements which all flying personnel must meet in order to remain on flying status. I believe the evidence you so ably presented in opposition to the amendment substantiates this contention. If any specific instances can be cited wherein we have failed in this respect, we would welcome such information and I assure you immediate corrective action will be taken.

I am sure you will agree that the adverse effects of this amendment could be so serious as to justify my requesting that you bring these facts and others of which you are so well aware to the attention of any who might help to avoid the consequences I have described. It is my view that those who proposed and supported the amendment in question did so because of misinformation and misunderstandings, which no one could correct at once but which might be corrected now. I have confidence that this will be accomplished.

I shall be glad to appear personally before your subcommittee or the joint conferees to present such additional information as you or any other member may desire.

Sincerely,

HOYT S. VANDENBERG,  
Chief of Staff, United States Air Force.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see pp. 13155-13156, House proceedings, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 10, 1951.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be adopted. I think the Chair had better lay before the Senate the action of the House on the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may state that that is not generally done until the conference report has been agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Action, of course, comes first on the conference report, and then the Senate will vote on the amendments which are in disagreement.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to raise a question in connection with the conference report, and to ask that it be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well; that is the pending question.

Mr. FERGUSON. That appears to be the only action the Senator from Michigan can take at the present time, in order to obtain the relief to which he feels he is entitled and to which the Senate is entitled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the conference report be rejected, because it is the only action which can be taken at this time, in order to reach the objective which I think the Senate of the United States should reach. That is the restoration of the so-called Byrd publicity amendment.

It was indicated that this conference report was signed by all the conferees. I know it was reported in order by the clerk, but I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that three members of the conference on the part of the House did not approve the conference report in relation to action in dropping one of the Senate amendments. Three of the Senate conferees likewise did not accept the conference report because of its deletion of Senate amendment numbered 106, which is the publicity amendment.

Mr. President, Senate amendment 106 is section 605 of this appropriation bill as it was reported from committee and passed the Senate without objection. The Senate conferees have receded from the amendment and it is not in the bill as it lies before us as a conference report. I want to read it to the Senate at this time so there will be no misunderstanding of the issue before us:

SEC. 605. No part of the money appropriated by this act to any department or made available for expenditure by any corporation contained in this act which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the aggregate budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such department or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions de-

scribed in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2). No person whose only performance of the functions described in (1) or (2) of the preceding sentence is in activities necessary for the enforcement of law, promotion of safety of human life, dissemination of weather information, or scientific experimentation, or whose compensation is paid from funds appropriated specifically for International Information and Educational Activities shall be deemed to be engaged in the performance of the functions so described.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is that the Byrd amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the so-called Byrd amendment, sponsored by by the senior Senator from Virginia and myself. The Senator from Virginia and the senior Senator from Michigan sponsored a similar amendment in connection with each of the other appropriations acts. It was omitted from the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act but was later made retroactively applicable to that law by a provision in the first supplemental appropriation bill.

To boil it down, Mr. President, this amendment was an attempt by Congress to limit the use of funds for publicity and propaganda activities to 75 percent of the amount asked in the budget estimates. There were exceptions. One of the exceptions was for the benefit of what we call the Voice of America in the State Department, so that it could function without hindrance. All the ramifications of the Voice of America were exempted from the operation of this particular amendment. So, with specified exceptions, the amendment applied a 25-percent cut against the budget estimates for publicity and propaganda activities in the various departments covered by the bill. That included appropriations for the State Department, and also for the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice. I find nowhere that the Commerce Department has objected to this amendment; I find nowhere that the Department of Justice has objected. There has been no objection from any of the other departments or agencies to whom similar restrictions have been applied. The only resistance comes from the State Department, which indicates that here, for some special reason, we have touched a very sore spot.

I am, indeed, very sorry that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is not able to be on the floor because of a very serious illness in his family. I know how strongly he feels about this particular amendment. The Senator from Michigan has on many occasions discussed with him the question involved. It has been a thorn in the side of both Houses of Congress for many years.



As far back as 1913 a statute was passed barring public-relations activities except as specifically authorized. Later, an attempt was made to limit this activity by saying it was illegal to use the money for lobbying purposes. Neither has been effective because we could not tell when a department would use any number of its employees on propaganda work, giving out information to the public. So we find that the rule has been violated many, many times. The distinguished Senator from Virginia and other Members of the Senate felt there was only one way to reach this problem, and that was to try to cut down on the amount of money available to the propaganda machines of the various departments and bureaus of the Government. We figured that the way to do that was to cut down 25 percent from the budget estimates, which gave ample room for the legitimate services of public information.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator yielding. I joined him in his work on this item for a reason which I should like to bring to his attention. I do not think he has mentioned it. In the Treasury appropriation bill, Public Law 111, this clause was included. In the independent offices appropriation bill, Public Law 137, it was included. In the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, Public Law 136, it was included. In the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, Public Law 135, it was included, and I am informed that it was included in the Department of Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill. In other words, the paragraph which the Senator is discussing, which he urged, and on which the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I joined him, is in every other major appropriation bill.

I should also like to invite attention to the fact that the following provision was incorporated in the first supplemental appropriation bill:

Any funds provided by this act shall not be available for compensation of persons performing domestic information functions or related supporting functions in excess of 50 percent of the amount provided herein.

I also invite attention to the fact that on October 10, 1951, Representative SMITH of Wisconsin offered a similar amendment to the second supplemental appropriation bill, and Representative MAHON agreed to put it in the bill. So that when it is taken out of this bill it is made the one exception of all the appropriation bills this year. For that reason the Senator from Michigan is being consistent in what he is now trying to do.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I joined in supporting the provision which has just been referred to by the Senator

from Michigan and the Senator from Massachusetts. I thought it was an excellent way to approach this troublesome question that so many of us have heard about and as to which so many discordant notes have developed. I should like to ask this question: Do I understand correctly that the amendment has been stricken out by the conferees?

Mr. FERGUSON. The entire amendment has been stricken out.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. It is completely eliminated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Can the Senator from Michigan point out in what way, logically and honestly, with that amendment retained, the department affected by this bill would actually have been curtailed?

Mr. FERGUSON. He cannot.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOODY. I am confident my distinguished colleague is interested with me in keeping the channels of information open between our foreign policy and the people. If the Senator will recall, and I am sure he does, a week ago there was widespread criticism of a security order which was issued by the President of the United States. As the Senator knows, I personally disagreed with the wording of that order. I felt that while the President and his adviser, Mr. Short, were trying to handle a very difficult problem, the problem of keeping our military information away from the enemy, while, at the same time, keeping the channels of information open, it had been done in an inadvisable way. I suggested at the time that some of the more experienced Washington newspaper men should be called in to advise on the question.

I merely want to say to my senior colleague, for whom I have great respect, as he knows, that it seems to me at this time, when there is so much controversy about the foreign policy of the United States, when there is in the Senate severe criticism of that policy, that when any organization in the country, such as a business men's organization, the Detroit Board of Commerce, the American Legion, or the Veterans of Foreign Wars request information there should be persons on hand to make factual reports to them. As the junior Senator from Kentucky said a few weeks ago, if they want reports they cannot get them from the elevator boys at the State Department. There must be competent persons to provide them.

I think the distinguished Senator may remember that one of the chief officials of this particular agency accompanied the Senator and myself on a trip abroad for the purpose of helping to provide more information about the foreign policy of the United States. It seems to me it would be very, very bad business to chop away, for the sake of saving a very small amount of money, the men whose responsibility it is to keep the channels of information open between the Department of State and the people. If

our foreign policy is wrong, it should be changed; and the way it should be changed is to have the information laid before the American people so that they can question the men who represent the department and by their questions record their objections to the policy. If it is right, the people have a right to know that, too. They have a right, in either event, to ask questions and to have those questions answered.

Mr. FERGUSON. I recognize the fact that the junior Senator from Michigan does not always agree with the senior Senator on questions of economy, and we are now discussing a question of economy. But as the Senator from Virginia said in one of his remarks when this amendment was first being offered on another bill, "I well recognize the need for the dissemination of information. I have no objection to it. It is my belief that the additional reduction would not in any way affect the legitimate efforts of agencies in disseminating information and answering requests from Members of Congress and the public generally."

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment. There is no attempt here to interfere with the State Department's replying when it receives a letter from the Board of Commerce of Detroit or of any other city. When we consider the millions of dollars which are appropriated for clerk hire and other help, when we consider that this amendment leaves 75 percent of the funds requested for public information, we can realize that there is certainly plenty of money provided to cover any such dissemination of news as is desired, either to Members of Congress or to the public generally.

Before I yield, I should like to read from the report of the Senate committee which put this amendment in the bill, so that it will be in the RECORD at this place as making absolutely clear what this amendment is designed to accomplish:

The committee recommends an amendment to limit the number of information specialists. This amendment has been included in several other appropriation bills. In recommending this amendment, the committee has made several changes to cover peculiar situations that exist within the departments covered by this bill.

To digress for a moment, the pending bill covers not only the State Department, but it covers the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice as well. Each of the departments required certain exemptions.

I read further from the report:

The committee agrees with the objectives of the amendment, which is to curtail the publicizing of the departments.

That is the point, "the publicizing of the departments."

However, the committee believes that it is not the intent of the amendment to curtail the dissemination of information which is necessary for enforcement of law by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Immigration and Naturalization Service; the promotion of safety of human life by such agencies as the Civil Aeronautics Administration; the dissemination of weather information; or, scientific experimentation by such agencies as the National Bureau of Standards and



the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The committee believes that it is entirely proper for a department to issue scientific and technical bulletins and publications in various fields which are devoted to keeping the public informed of changes in those fields. However, the committee admonishes the departments that its intent is to cut down the flood of publicity releases now being sent out by the departments.

Now I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I am not questioning the intent of the senior Senator from Michigan or the senior Senator from Virginia. I am merely pointing out to the Senator from Michigan that it is not possible to provide an adequate service of information without having information officers to attend to it.

The opinion of the conferees representing the Senate, headed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the judgment of a majority of the conferees was that this conference report should be adopted as it stands, and that the item under discussion should be left in the report. I would submit to the Senator that if he is interested in keeping the channels of information open, and not blocking them at a time when our Nation's safety is threatened, I am sure he will agree that it is not wise at all to overturn the judgment of the large majority of the conferees representing the Senate and the House, and in the closing days of the session send the whole bill back to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. The senior Senator from Michigan has stated that this report was not approved by all the conferees.

Mr. MOODY. I did not say it was.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I indicated before, three Senators disagreed to the report so far as the item I am discussing is concerned, and three of the House conferees likewise dissented.

Mr. MOODY. I said it was agreed to by a majority of the conferees representing the House and the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is obviously correct; otherwise it would not be before the Senate.

Mr. President, today the Senate adopted a conference report cutting the appropriation for public relations in the Military Establishment from \$16,000,000 to \$10,000,000. As the Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, it has been a consistent policy of this Congress to limit expenditures for public relations. There is no distinction between the Federal Security Agency, or any other departments of the Government, and the State Department, so far as this function is concerned. We are not interfering with the Voice of America. As a matter of fact, we are interfering only slightly with the use of money to publicize a department, and not at all with necessary public information activities. But here, in the State Department, we seem to have touched a very sore spot. Why, Mr. President?

James Reston, who wrote an article which appeared in the New York Times a few days ago, and which was placed in the RECORD, has indicated clearly what is happening and why the issue is raised

now. If the President's order goes into effect, as he has indicated he desires that it shall, to restrict the information that is to go to the public, the department should have no need for this 25 percent which we would eliminate, because the order will classify, as security, not only those things which actually pertain to the security of the country, but it will also keep secret from the people of the United States matters which it does not want the public to know, information which might be embarrassing, as the OPS supplement to the President's order said.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment. There was recently revealed an example of this juggling of information in proceedings before the Internal Security Subcommittee, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada is the chairman. We could not get a transcript of a certain conference in the State Department which was of vital interest to the committee. The Subcommittee on Internal Security sits in open session and takes sworn testimony. It asked for this transcript but it could not get the recorded facts. It does get statements from the State Department's publicity mill disputing the testimony of witnesses, and in effect calling them perjurers. But the representatives of those making those statements do not come and testify about the same set of facts.

Here is the point, Mr. President. It appears that when a release makes good or favorable publicity for the State Department, the people of the United States will get it through Department channels, as they got one last night. However, that release did not even sustain what the Department thought it would sustain. No wonder Congress has felt righteous wrath about what is going on in the various departments.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to point out to the Senator that he is shifting back and forth from the security order to the pending question. As he knows, I do not question the intent behind the security order, but I do question the execution of it. The order should be re-examined and changed. But does it not leave an entirely misleading impression to say that the purpose of the division here involved is merely to publicize the State Department? I am sure the Senator well knows the work that is being done, for example, by the organization under Mr. Ben Crosby, who, as the Senator knows, is a war veteran, with a great war record. He is not a publicity seeker at all. He and his group are men who are contacting or are contacted by reputable organizations, by no means all of which agree with the foreign policies of the United States. These men serve as contacts for women's clubs, veterans' organizations, business clubs, labor organizations and others who desire to get information on various points regarding our foreign policy.

As the Senator knows, or should know, when a representative of that group goes out and makes a statement before any organization of that sort, he is subjected to questioning. He cannot go out and simply make a propaganda statement. Representatives of the Department are questioned both publicly and privately by representatives of the organizations before which they are appearing.

The Senator asked what the distinction was between the Department of Defense and the Department of State. There have been political attacks, as the Senator well knows, upon the Department of State and upon the foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, those subjects have become highly controversial.

Only the other day, when we had before us the nomination of a very able American, Chester Bowles, to be Ambassador to India, we heard him attacked heavily. What was the burden of the attacks? The burden was that more career men in the Foreign Service ought to be appointed to ambassadorships.

I might point out to the Senator that that is the very same Foreign Service which has often been attacked here. For more than a year some of the same Senators who were then criticizing that appointment and demanding reappointment of Foreign Service officers have been among those tearing down the confidence of the people in that same Foreign Service.

I think this issue is perfectly clear. If we want channels of information open, let us keep them open. Let us not clog them, either by misguided security views, or by eliminating from the Department those who are serving as a conduit of information to organizations outside.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Michigan realizes that the man in charge of public relations in one of the divisions of the State Department is a close personal friend of the senior Senator from Michigan. When it comes to a question of principle, such as is involved here, and when it comes to limiting appropriations in line with a principle with respect to one bill and not all bills, the senior Senator from Michigan cannot allow his principles to be sacrificed because the head of one of the bureaus in the Department, whom he would personally trust, is involved. When it comes to the question of the amount of money which is to be spent in the particular Department, there are supervisors over him.

It is now stated on the floor of the Senate that there is a political attack upon the State Department. Apparently the subcommittee of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], which is hearing sworn testimony that certainly reflects upon the State Department, is now being accused of making a political attack upon the State Department. I know of no basis for calling that committee's work a political attack. What that particular subcommittee is trying to do is to present the facts to the American people as to what took place with respect to a certain organization which at one time was perfectly



proper and had a good cause, but which was penetrated for the purpose of making it follow a certain line, which would be detrimental to the United States.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment.

Senators who voted against confirming the nomination of Chester Bowles are accused of having done so from purely political motives. I say that that is not a fact. It is a sad day when loyal Americans cannot raise their voices without being accused of political motives when they criticize a certain foreign policy.

I started to make reference to what Jim Reston, of the New York Times, has said. Let us see what happens at some of these meetings, and let us find out whether the Department is really anxious to keep the channels of information clear and give the people of America all the facts.

Reference has been made to conferences where the public, or representatives of public groups, come in to discuss policy matters with representatives of the State Department. I want to know how various individuals receive invitations to come to Washington. I want to know who selects the individuals who come here and receive spoon-fed information from this Department. That is the real issue—spoon feeding. When a congressional subcommittee such as the Security Subcommittee wants information with respect to what is taking place in the Department, it cannot obtain such information. I will show other examples of how this Department controls the information that goes out. But when there is something for which the Department wants wide and favorable circulation all stops are out. That, Mr. President, is spoon feeding, and that is what I am protesting. That is what Congress is objecting to when it seeks to limit publicity and public relations activities to straightforward responses to public inquiries.

Now listen to what is going on in the very Department under discussion today, the Department whose spokesmen are trying to get more money from Congress for what is called the dissemination of news. Let me tell the Senate how this Department disseminates news.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. In just a moment.

I read from the New York Times an article by James Reston to which I have referred. The dispatch is dated Washington, October 2:

Several events of the last few weeks indicate why the press and radio have been slightly skeptical of President Truman's recent order authorizing Federal civilian agencies to withhold information from the public for security reasons.

We are accused of wanting to reduce this appropriation because we do not agree with the foreign policy of the United States. The foreign policy of the United States was not involved in connection with other bills, nor is it involved in this case, because we allow the Department, through the Voice of

America, to disseminate all the information it wishes.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOL- LAND in the chair). Does the senior Senator from Michigan yield to the junior Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. In just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The charge has been made that I am acting only from political motives. I want to show the facts on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. MOODY. I did not say that the Senator was actuated by purely political motives, if he will pardon my saying so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is out of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. I read from the article by James Reston:

WASHINGTON, October 2.—Several events of the last few weeks indicate why the press and radio have been slightly skeptical of President Truman's recent order authorizing Federal civilian agencies to withhold information from the public for security reasons.

Among these events were the following:

1. At the recent meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Ottawa, Secretary of State Dean Acheson not only opposed publication of limited and officially edited summaries of the general debate on the world situation, as proposed by public-relations officers of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, but also opposed publication of the agenda of the meeting. Incidentally, the official agenda had already been published when he opposed publication of it.

This is the Department which is shedding crocodile tears because the United States Congress is cutting off funds which are alleged to be necessary in order that the Department may give the public the news as to what is going on in the State Department. Jim Reston is accurate in this report, it is undisputed. The Department did not even want to publish that which it had already given out. The President says that no one should print anything merely because it is given to him by a high public official. He should decide for himself whether or not it should be published, and should pay no attention to the material which comes from the departments, because, says the President, if they do they will publish something which is wrong, or something which is against the interests of the United States Government.

It is said that the Department wants to give the people the news. Did it give the people the news about the Ottawa conference? Is the Department going to call to Washington representatives of boards of commerce and of labor organizations and give them the news some time later? Back in October of 1949 representatives of labor organizations were called to the State Department for briefing upon foreign policy, and for advice on certain phases of foreign policy. Do Senators suppose that the Internal Security Committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr.

McCARRAN], could obtain such information? No. It has demanded it, but it cannot obtain it.

I want to go on and show that the Department wishes to operate a propaganda machine and not an information machine:

2. The State Department placed a "restricted" stamp on a catalog of the names and hotel addresses of the delegates at the recent Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in San Francisco. This prevented reporters from getting the list until other delegations, objecting to the ruling, made the list public.

3. The White House recently blocked publication of a report by one of its own top officials because the report was critical of some aspects of the administration's rearmament effort, and presumably because it coincided with the dismissal of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

4. The Treasury Department recently held back news of irregularity in the Internal Revenue Bureau in St. Louis until compelled to acknowledge the problem by disclosure on Capitol Hill.

The Senator from Michigan could talk at length on that case, in which the evidence was secreted. Just yesterday the top man from that office of the Internal Revenue Bureau was indicted. We have a scandal out in San Francisco, and we have had them in other cities. When the people of this country learn all the facts they will decide whether or not we should cut something out of these appropriations for spoon-feeding public information.

I go now to an analysis of some of these situations. Mr. Reston writes:

There were some security angles to the Ottawa conference that had to be handled carefully—although it is doubtful if any NATO military scheme can be put into effect in Europe without the Communists, who are part of almost every continental army, knowing all about it—but in the main that conference dealt with several basic criticisms of United States policy, which our officials did not particularly want publicized.

Therefore, at Ottawa, a strict security policy was invoked. The following week, however, Premier Alcide de Gasperi, of Italy, came to Washington, and the Government wanted publicity.

Now we are beginning to see how this machine really works. One time it wants to silence public information. But the next time it wants the trumpets to blow. And so the wheels of news dissemination are made to turn. It is a major function, to be sure. That is why they do not want the Congress to enforce a 25-percent cut in the budget estimate. I continue to read:

So the big information machine was put to work. Background press conferences were held all over the place; communiques, speeches, statements of approval were issued galore. Officials who wouldn't look at a reporter in Ottawa were suddenly amiable and even loquacious on those aspects of the visit they thought would impress opinion in Italy.

#### MATTER OF NEWS VALUE

Just why this visit was more newsworthy than the visit of the Canadian Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent a few days later was not clear, but in the De Gasperi case the administration decided to make news while on the other visit—during which Mr. St. Laurent made the decidedly newsworthy suggestion that Canada build the St. Lawrence seaway herself if necessary—the ad-



ministration gave him short shrift and even sent Maj. Gen. Harry Vaughan to the airport to meet him.

They felt that would be sufficient news—not what he had to say, but that General Vaughan had met him.

In short, there is a widespread suspicion here that the administration tinkers with the news over and above the requirements of security, and partly as a result of the rearmament program, partly in response to Congress' emphasis on security regulations, is now more security-minded than anybody except the Russians.

Of course, Congress is security-minded now. It cannot forget the Hiss case. It cannot forget some of the other cases. Of course, it is security-minded.

Mr. President, we want to give the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Commerce sufficient money to operate efficiently in the public interest. But must we accept these programs as necessary?

Mr. President, let me reemphasize that this limitation was placed in the bill by the committee. It was approved by the Senate, without objection. It is a subject of consistent policy. There was disagreement in conference. Four of the conference members on the Senate side were in favor of adopting the report without this amendment in it. Three of the Senate members were against that action, insisting on its retention. For the House, four were in favor of adopting the report, without the amendment, and three were against it.

We now find ourselves in the position where there is only one thing we can do in order that we may reinsert the amendment. We must send the bill back to conference, and that can be accomplished only by rejecting the conference report. It is the intention of the senior Senator from Michigan, as soon as a vote can be taken—and if it is sent back—to move that the new conferees on the part of the Senate go back into conference and agree to all other items as they have previously been agreed upon by the conferees, but to disagree to the taking out of this particular amendment.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to say that as a Washington correspondent, as well as a Senator, I have been critical of some of the same points which the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan has mentioned.

However, I want to tell him that the particular agency he is now speaking of reducing is an agency which I believe is fulfilling an excellent function in the public interest.

He mentioned the fact that a member of the agency is his close friend. I would, of course, expect to take the action which he thinks is the right action whether his friend is a member of the agency or not.

I brought up the division of Mr. Crosby merely to impress the senior Senator from Michigan with the fact that the agency of which he is speaking does not meet the description which he is giving

of it. It is devoted to giving the public information, not propaganda.

I may add that I did not say that the senior Senator from Michigan was motivated only by politics. I said that there have been political attacks on the State Department made on the floor of the Senate. I am sure the senior Senator from Michigan must have heard some of those attacks. I do not believe that he would dispute that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. The senior Senator from Michigan not only heard attacks made upon the State Department, but he has made some of them.

Mr. MOODY. Then, why did the senior Senator from Michigan contradict my statement?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not dispute the statement that the State Department has been attacked. I believe that many of their policies are wrong.

Mr. MOODY. That is the very point I am trying to make. The best way for the American people to find out whether they agree with the policies—and I may say that with some of the policies I have not always agreed, either—the best way to determine whether they should be changed, or whether they should be retained, is to keep the channels of information open between this agency and the people. The various organizations around the country which are sending in requests for information cannot be answered by a clerk. They cannot be answered by an elevator boy, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] pointed out the other day. They must be handled by competent people.

The senior Senator from Michigan must know that not only his own friend, but others of similar caliber down there, are providing on a factual basis information which is requested. I do not believe the senior Senator from Michigan would dispute that fact.

If they are not providing information on a factual basis they are certainly laying themselves wide open to be questioned.

I notice that the senior Senator from Michigan is picking up the Reston article. In most respects it was a good article, but the statements in it do not apply to this particular situation. If we undermine the ability of the division in the State Department to answer inquiries of the American people we are serving to clog up the channels of information between our foreign policy makers and the public, to whom the makers of our foreign policy are responsible. I cannot see why the conference report should be rejected at this time after this matter has been considered by both Houses of Congress and by the committee of conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, Mr. Crosby is the head of only one segment of this activity, namely, the public liaison division in the office of public affairs. He has 47 employees under him. The question is whether the Department can reduce its functions by 25 percent.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the senior Senator from Michigan yield to junior Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. What my colleague has referred to is not the question. I referred to Mr. Crosby only because I know that he is known by both the senior Senator from Michigan and myself. Mr. Crosby is not one who answers to the description of the propagandists and the befuddlers whom the senior Senator from Michigan apparently would like the Senate to believe are handling this situation in this Department. If my colleague will talk to some of the other gentlemen there, I feel sure that he will find that they are equal in caliber to Mr. Crosby.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan read from the article by Mr. Reston and referred to him as an authority, and he believes what Mr. Reston said. The Senator knows from his personal knowledge what has occurred in the case of the Internal Security Committee, in connection with this matter. On all occasions when we have attempted to obtain information, we have been given only such information as is believed to be favorable to the administration as in the case of the meeting at the White House regarding military aid to China. In that case they gave out only what they were forced to give out and as a result of publication of the diary of the late Senator Vandenberg. Only the information which that diary forced them to give out in regard to the meetings at the White House was given out. Only after Mr. Stassen kept notes and gave his version and only after Mr. Lattimore and Mr. Russell demanded that the paper be released, was it released.

While I stand here on the floor of the Senate debating this matter, the Internal Security Committee is hearing Professor Colegrove, who has a good memory of what took place at those meetings. We have to rely upon his testimony, and that of others who are not subject to discipline or reprisals as Government employees.

Mr. President, "Scotty" Reston is correct when he says that those in charge of the information agencies in the executive departments and agencies in many cases release only information which is favorable to the administration. Mr. Reston cites certain cases of that sort. Of course, what he complains about is not true in all cases; neither is it always true that the information officers give out only information which is favorable to the administration, for sometimes they are forced to give out information which is not favorable to the administration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask several questions, if I may.

Is it not true that the Voice of America is not affected by this amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not affected at all by it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, the information going from the United States to other countries is not affected in any way by this amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.



Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not also true that in the Appropriations Committee we have been trying very hard to reduce the expenditures of the Government which are not immediately connected with or concerned with our security and our defense?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not also true that we have done that, in part, because of the enormous appropriation bill of \$56,000,000,000 which has just gone through the Senate?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not also true that for every other department and agency the 25-percent cut in the publicity and information division was accepted without complaint, so far as we know?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They may not have liked it, but they did not complain actively, did they?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The same is true of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice, which are covered in this bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They have not complained about this matter, have they?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; they have not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. All of us want the information which is issued to be as accurate as possible, but we must, insofar as we possibly can, reduce governmental expenditures on the civil side of the Government?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Without going into the question of whether the information or propaganda is correct or incorrect or is political or is not political, the point is that it is necessary to make what in this case is a very small cut, but, as a matter of principle, to make all possible reductions in the appropriations for the various agencies of our Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. A principal is involved.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, this amendment received bipartisan support. On the other side of the aisle, the Senator from Virginia and a number of his distinguished colleagues voted for this amendment and favored it, and distinguished Senators on this side of the aisle also were in favor of it. It was adopted on this bill without objection. On the only record vote taken with respect to this amendment on another bill it prevailed by a vote of 63 to 10.

However, now, for the first time, we are told that it is political in its implications and is being urged by those who do not like the State Department. That is why I have raised some of these questions.

Oh, yes, Mr. President; some may call this a political matter, and some persons may say that we have no proof that the administration wishes to conceal all information not favorable to it, and is willing to release only the information which is favorable to it. But just remember how Mr. Jessup took to Guam a stenographer who listened behind a screen and took notes. She was a Government employee, she was paid by Government

funds, and thus the people of the United States paid for the taking of those notes. However, were those notes released when that stenographer and that group returned to the United States? No, Mr. President; those in charge released the information to one or two newspapers which they thought could put it up as a trial balloon and at a time when they figured the release of the information was important to the administration. Then, finally, the MacArthur hearings were able to obtain a deleted transcript. The transcript which the administration's officials released to the press contained things which were not even allowed to be given to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at their joint meeting.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. The senior Senator from Michigan has said several times that I have accused him of being political about this matter. I simply wish to set him straight.

I said that he must have heard in the Senate political attacks made on the State Department. There have been many attacks of that sort. Probably more misinformation has been spread in this general area of foreign policy than has been spread about any other public issue existing today. A great deal of controversy has existed about it, and a great deal of misinformation has been bandied about regarding our foreign policy. I feel quite sure that the senior Senator from Michigan would not deny that.

It happens to be my opinion that it is vitally important that men of the type of Mr. Crosby be available to organizations such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, women's organizations, labor organizations, and other organizations which frequently make inquiries in regard to specific points in connection with the foreign policy of the United States.

I am glad to hear that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] wants to keep the channels of information open. I am sure he does. He says that all of us want to reduce the civil expenses of the Government, because of the great load of military expenditures; and all of us do want to do that.

However, in the case of a situation in which there has been so much controversy and in connection with which so many misleading statements have been made, I do not believe we should reduce the ability of the American people to find out, by inquiry and reply, what the policy is and where it can be criticized.

I should like to add, if I may, that as a working Washington newspaperman, I knew a little, at least, about the way that those who were writing news for the people back home obtain the news when they need to get points of information very quickly. It is true that in Washington there are information agencies which, in my opinion, could be severely curtailed. However, I feel that in the area of foreign policy, about which so many inquiries are properly made, the quick availability of information is im-

portant to the American people. When a Washington newspaper reporter is asked by his newspaper or by his syndicate to check on a certain piece of information, he is not generally able to call the Secretary of State or the Assistant Secretary of State. On occasion he may be able to do so; but ordinarily, in the case of the average piece of information, he must call an information officer.

I may say to the senior Senator from my State that any information officer who tries to "bunk" a reporter in this town will not last very long, because reporters recognize that very quickly.

As to the complaints made by "Scotty" Reston, let me say that of course there are instances of that sort. I was very glad that the senior Senator from Michigan had that article printed in the RECORD the other day, because those instances should be corrected.

However, the fact remains that in this area of foreign policy, where so much misinformation has been spread, and where there is such an urgent need to keep open the channels of information, we in the Senate should not act to clog them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, after the 25-percent reduction is made, there will be plenty left to finance the release of legitimate news and replies to public inquiries. Even with only 75 percent of the money requested there will be available to these departments considerable amount to spend on trial balloons, and send out the information when they think the proper time has arrived for the public to receive it, and what they want the public to receive.

One would think that the only office in the State Department which gives any news or information or propaganda is the one which calls in the American Legion, the labor unions, and the chambers of commerce. I do not know what news they get, but I do know that a committee of the Senate cannot get the news, even though they request it through the chairman of the committee, as we have been doing in the past.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there are many things which have been said by the able Senator from Michigan with which I can wholeheartedly concur. I am not going to take the floor this afternoon to enter into a discussion wherein I shall defend the State Department. If there is any Senator on this floor who has been more shot at by the State Department than the senior Senator from Nevada, I should like to know who he is—shot at, not only by the State Department and those employed by the State Department, but by those who are on the outside who perhaps are favored by the State Department. That is not the issue. If it were, I would be in a different position.

There are many things that can be said about what goes on in the State Department. But, Mr. President, what is involved before the Senate now is an appropriation bill which was passed by



both Houses, which was then sent to conference, and which now stands before the Senate, after the conference, by a majority vote of both sides of the conference table, has agreed to it, and after the House of Representatives, the House, where the bill originated, has agreed to it.

What is involved? How much is involved? Remember, Mr. President, this bill carries a 10-percent cut which applies all the way through. It applies to the State Department, it applies to the personnel in that Department. That is not in dispute. That stands and is a fixed part of the bill. How much is involved?

Let me recite the history regarding the consideration of the bill by the conference committee. On five occasions we met in conference on the items contained in the bill. Every item submitted to the conference was studied. The Senate conferees receded on several amendments. The House conferees receded on more than were receded on by the Senate conferees. On the third meeting of the conferees we came to the item now being discussed, and on that occasion undoubtedly an impasse was encountered. We adjourned, but before doing so the Senator from Michigan, in his zeal—and he is zealous; there is no question about the Senator's zeal in anything he undertakes—in his zeal to carry out a principle, undoubtedly, he agreed to take 12½ percent, and so we came back into the fourth meeting of the conferees with an impasse of 12½ percent in this particular item. The Senator was adamant on 12½ percent.

What would 12½ percent mean in the way of figures? After effecting a 25-percent cut in information specialists, the Senator from Michigan, as I have said, in conference was agreeable to 12½ percent. We had already effected a 10-percent cut, as I have stated, and that is in the bill. So it meant an additional cut of 2½ percent. For the State Department this involves only seven employees—seven employees, or \$35,000. The bill carries more than \$1,000,000,000—\$1,043,000,000.

Are we to reach an impasse and turn down a bill making appropriations for the State Department, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Judiciary because of seven persons who might be eliminated, and a cut of \$35,000? It simply did not seem to the chairman of the conference committee that that was worth while, although in principle I want to say now, and I will say it with my dying breath, I think there should be a cut and some action should be taken to prevent this everlasting increase of employees in the various departments, who are engaged in little more than sending out information, some of it of a twisted nature.

I am not going to recede from this position. I do not take issue with the Senator from Michigan on many things he says, but the situation is presented, after the Congress has been in session continuously, for nearly 10 months, of having an impasse created between the two Houses on a great appropriation bill when all that is involved is \$35,000 and

seven individuals. As one of the four conferees on the part of the Senate, I voted to break the impasse. The House has adopted the report, and it is now before the Senate.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to send the report back to conference and thereby hold the Senate of the United States and the Congress for God knows how long; because if the bill goes back to conference, it goes back with every item in dispute, and where shall we be then?

That is all I have to say on this question. I regret that I must take issue with the Senator from Michigan, because in many respects we stand together. In many thoughts we are together. In many ideas we are together. But I cannot go along with him on this matter, because he does not stand on ground sufficiently solid to justify sending the bill back to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan feels that there is no more solid ground in the world than is the solid granite of principle. Whether it be 7 employees or whether it be 7,000 employees, there is a principle involved. The Senate voted to place the amendment in the bill. The Senator from Michigan did offer a compromise in the conference, to break a deadlock. But, Mr. President, that offer of mine in the conference would not have compromised the principle; it would have upheld the principle, even though the amount involved was small.

I have taken the Senate floor to ask the Senate that it send the bill back to conference, because it is on the basis of principle that it should go back. Have we come to the time when we must yield to expediency? Must we yield to our desires for adjournment? Must we sacrifice principle? Must we tie our ship of state to a drifting buoy? No, Mr. President; we must stand upon principle. In the case of every other Department and agencies we cut the amount of money available for propaganda purposes. Under no principle of logic or reason can it be said that we should not now take it from the three agencies involved in this bill.

Again let me say that while an offer of compromise on dollars was made in the conference, it was not made on principle. And let me emphasize also that while we have been talking about the State Department because that is the source of resistance, the Departments of Commerce and Justice are equally affected by this amendment in this bill.

I am sure that if the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] were permitted to be present on the floor today, he, too, would raise his voice for the principle which is involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we asked for the yeas and nays. I thought they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They were not ordered; there was not a sufficient second.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan withhold for a moment his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. FERGUSON. I withhold it.

#### ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE MEAT INDUSTRY BY EDWARD P. MORGAN

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, for the past several weeks I have noted the press releases being issued by the Enforcement Director of the Office of Price Stabilization.

This official, Edward P. Morgan by name, has, in what I think is in an irresponsible manner, accused American businessmen of threatening to destroy the price control program.

In what I consider to be a high-handed fashion, this same Mr. Morgan has threatened to jail American businessmen who do not comply with the directives of his agency.

The latest outburst from this gentleman was on October 6, when he stated that—

There are affirmative efforts by the meat industry to sabotage the entire stabilization program.

He accused cattlemen and processors of a number of violations.

None of the "alleged violations," Morgan said, "can be minimized or characterized as inconsequential." He stated that injunctions were being sought in Federal courts throughout the country against several hundred of the alleged violators. He described as "most uncooperative, the attitude of the American Meat Institute."

The meat institute in Chicago, according to the Associated Press, replied that—

Time, and not loose talk and mischievous allegations will prove that everything wrong with the meat is the result of the Office of Price Stabilization's own price control regulations which threaten complete disruption of the consumers' meat supply in legal trade channels.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that Mr. Morgan is indulging in the technique, now attempted to be made in certain quarters, of defaming any person or group who opposes them.

If Mr. Morgan knows any violations of the law as an enforcement official, I am sure all of us would like to see him immediately proceed to prove those violations in a court of law and punish the violators. Let him refrain from indulging in these attacks.

This technique of not naming people and accusing groups by the use of the word "they" should cease.

I recall just a brief few months ago when this same Mr. Edward Morgan was general counsel of the so-called Tydings committee to investigate the infiltration of Communists into the State Department.

As general counsel of that committee it was incumbent upon this Mr. Morgan to determine the veracity or the falsity of the charges leveled against the State Department.

Was he as belligerent? Was he as militant then as he is now? No, indeed; he was not. I recall that on the Senate floor on July 24, 1950, as reported in the



CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, on pages 10970 to 10977, there was much discussion of certain tactics of leaving out of the printed text part of the testimony and proceedings, and as a Senator said at the time, "I shall not characterize such methods because I think they speak for themselves."

Did not Earl Browder, the leader of the Communist Party of the United States, publicly announce that he was using that committee as a "transmission belt for Communist propaganda"? Did he not get away with much of it even though Mr. Morgan was general counsel of the committee?

Did Mr. Morgan, as general counsel of the committee, allow the known Communists to appear before that committee and to commit flagrant contempt of Congress for which they were cited? Did Mr. Morgan so phrase his legal questions, so lay the legal foundation, that these contempt citations would be upheld in the courts of law? Many think he did not. When these cases of Browder and Field were brought into the courts it was demonstrated that a proper foundation had not been laid by the committee's general counsel, Mr. Edward P. Morgan. As a matter of fact, the courts found that Mr. Browder was most cooperative with Mr. Morgan.

Did this now bellicose individual, who is threatening American businessmen, threaten the Communists when they were before him? No; the record is clear.

My memory extends back to the Pearl Harbor affair. Many called it the white-wash investigation. Who participated as counsel in that hearing? Was it not Edward P. Morgan? Did he dig in and present all the facts? There have been grave doubts expressed as to that.

I for one am glad that the American Meat Institute, Inc., is not as cooperative with Mr. Morgan as was Earl Browder. Let Mr. Morgan talk less and bring these cases into the open, into the courts, and get busy. Let him cease to charge unidentified groups of American citizens. Let him refrain from accusing the great cattle and packing industry of the United States. Let Mr. Morgan put it on the line if he has the facts as to violations, or admit that he is just talking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an Associated Press article entitled "OPS Aides Say Meat Rules Are Violated."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### OPS AIDES SAY MEAT RULES ARE VIOLATED

New York, October 6.—Thirty-eight percent of the Nation's slaughterers are violating meat controls, says the Office of Price Stabilization's enforcement director.

The official, Edward P. Morgan, adds that there are affirmative efforts by the meat industry "to sabotage the entire stabilization program."

Mr. Morgan told a news conference here yesterday that the OPS drive that began September 25 against illegal slaughtering practices has uncovered 532 violators among 1,445 plants visited by OPS agents.

He said there are more than 10,000 slaughterers in the country.

Violations of meat control regulations, Mr. Morgan said, included the buying of cattle and selling of meat at above ceiling prices, tie-in sales, false weighing, upgraded and unmarked meat, and falsification of and failure to keep proper records.

None of the alleged violations, Morgan said, "can be minimized or characterized as inconsequential."

Mr. Morgan said injunctions are being sought in Federal courts throughout the country against several hundred of the alleged violators, many accused of more than one irregularity.

The enforcement official described as "most uncooperative" the attitude of the American Meat Institute, Inc., a major trade association with headquarters in Chicago.

Mr. Morgan said the institute and the National Independent Meat Packers' Association were trying to destroy the price control program.

The meat institute in Chicago replied that "time and not loose talk and mischievous allegations will prove that everything wrong with meat is the result of the OPS' own price control regulations which threaten complete disruption of the consumers' meat supply in legal trade channels."

Earlier, the packers' association said "there is a reasonably adequate supply of meat and the people ought to be getting it." The association said restrictive price control keeps meat off the market.

#### CLEANER AIR WEEK

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] was called away on official business, and I ask unanimous consent, on his behalf, to place in the RECORD a letter and to read a very brief statement prepared by him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The statement is as follows:

As governor of Pennsylvania I heartily endorsed an observance of Cleaner Air Week last year, and it was gratifying to have a very great many cities and towns throughout the State participate in the program.

This year the event is being planned to cover even a wider scope of activities. It will serve as a starting point for year-round air-pollution control by soliciting the cooperation of public officials, chambers of commerce, and other civic organizations, industries, building owners, and householders. I commend Cleaner Air Week as a contribution to better living and more efficient use of our fuel resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a letter from Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer, endorsing Cleaner Air Week.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, August 14, 1951.

Mr. CHARLES N. HOWISON,  
National Chairman, Cleaner Air Week  
Committee, Air Pollution and Smoke  
Prevention Association of America,  
Cincinnati, Ohio.

DEAR Mr. HOWISON: I am happy to endorse the objectives of Cleaner Air Week and to urge the adoption of measures which have proved to be effective in preventing air pollution. In the elimination of smoke, ash, and industrial fumes and gases, there occurs an outstanding example of the way in which business interests and public interests join together.

Installation of equipment to prevent or reduce air pollution can result in substan-

tial reductions of costs to industry. I refer to the visible costs of such items as fuel, factory upkeep and maintenance—including cleaning of buildings—as well as such hidden costs as time lost through absenteeism or illness on the job caused by noxious fumes.

We cannot afford, especially at this time, such a waste of materials and energy. I hope that interest aroused during Cleaner Air Week will carry on throughout the year and result in continuing and increasing success in achieving your objectives.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SAWYER,  
Secretary of Commerce.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|               |                 |              |
|---------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Benton        | Hayden          | McKellar     |
| Brewster      | Hendrickson     | McMahon      |
| Butler, Md.   | Hennings        | Millikin     |
| Butler, Nebr. | Hickenlooper    | Moody        |
| Cain          | Hill            | Murray       |
| Capehart      | Hoey            | O'Mahoney    |
| Carlson       | Holland         | Robertson    |
| Case          | Humphrey        | Russell      |
| Chavez        | Hunt            | Saltonstall  |
| Clements      | Ives            | Schoeppel    |
| Connally      | Johnston, S. C. | Smathers     |
| Cordon        | Kefauver        | Smith, N. C. |
| Dworshak      | Kerr            | Sparkman     |
| Eaton         | Knowland        | Stennis      |
| Ellender      | Lehman          | Thye         |
| Ferguson      | Lodge           | Underwood    |
| Flanders      | Magnuson        | Welker       |
| Frear         | Malone          | Williams     |
| Fulbright     | McCarran        | Young        |
| George        | McFarland       |              |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report on the appropriation bill for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and the Judiciary.

Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. FERGUSON asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there is now only one way in which the Senate can insist upon keeping amendment numbered 106 in the bill. That is by rejecting the conference report from which the amendment has been dropped. This is substantially the same amendment as was enacted in all the other general appropriation bills. The amendment would reduce by 25 percent the appropriation for public relations specialists, with certain exceptions, such as the Voice of America.

This amendment was offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the senior Senator from Michigan. The only way it can be taken back to conference and restored is by means of a "nay" vote on the question of agreeing to the conference report.



The Senator from Michigan feels that we should try once more to adhere to the principle that there should be a reduction in the public-relations activities covered by the pending bill. This principle has been carried out in connection with each of the other regular appropriation bills, and even in the two supplemental bills, by the inclusion of a similar provision. Therefore I hope that the principle may be maintained, and that the conference report will be rejected.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this question involves a return to conference of the appropriation bill for the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and the Judiciary. There were 108 items in dispute. All of them have been settled by the conferees except one item, with respect to which a majority of the conferees agreed.

If the bill goes back to conference, all the items will be in dispute, and no one can tell when or if the bill may come back to the House and Senate again.

Only seven positions and \$35,000 are involved. I say that by way of explanation. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] agreed to a compromise of 12½ percent as against 25 percent.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have sought to indicate that was a compromise on percentages, to break a deadlock, and not a compromise on principle such as is abandonment of the limitation.

Mr. McCARRAN. There are 283 positions of this kind in the State Department. A 10 percent reduction would cut them to 255 positions. A 12½ percent cut would reduce them to 248 positions. Hence, there are only 7 positions involved, and \$35,000. To send this bill, carrying \$1,043,000,000 back to conference, when it is not known when it could come out of conference again, seems to me to be out of line.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that there are activities in the Department of Commerce and in the Justice Department which would also be affected; and, therefore, it is not a cut of only seven positions?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. There are two positions in the Department of Commerce, and not more than one or two in the Department of Justice.

Mr. FERGUSON. In conference, still acting on principle, the Senator from Michigan did offer a reduction of 12½ percent, instead of 25 percent. That offer was not accepted. Four of the seven Senate members of the conference committee approved of the conference report. The same number of House Members approved the report. All that we can do now is to send the bill back to conference and insist that the amendment stay in the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to state that the conference report was approved by the House on yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maine would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Penn-

sylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maine would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 27, as follows:

#### YEAS—31

|          |                 |              |
|----------|-----------------|--------------|
| Benton   | Humphrey        | Moody        |
| Chavez   | Hunt            | Murray       |
| Clements | Johnston, S. C. | O'Mahoney    |
| Connally | Kefauver        | Russell      |
| Ellender | Kerr            | Smathers     |
| Frear    | Lehman          | Smith, N. C. |
| George   | Magnuson        | Sparkman     |
| Hennings | McCarran        | Stennis      |
| Hill     | McFarland       | Underwood    |
| Hoey     | McKellar        |              |
| Holland  | McMahon         |              |

#### NAYS—27

|               |              |             |
|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| Brewster      | Eaton        | Malone      |
| Butler, Md.   | Ferguson     | Millikin    |
| Butler, Nebr. | Flanders     | Robertson   |
| Cain          | Fulbright    | Saltonstall |
| Capehart      | Hendrickson  | Schoeppel   |
| Carlson       | Hickenlooper | Thye        |
| Case          | Ives         | Welker      |
| Cordon        | Knowland     | Williams    |
| Dworshak      | Lodge        | Young       |

#### NOT VOTING—38

|          |                |              |
|----------|----------------|--------------|
| Aiken    | Jenner         | Mundt        |
| Anderson | Johnson, Colo. | Neely        |
| Bennett  | Johnson, Tex.  | Nixon        |
| Bricker  | Kem            | O'Connor     |
| Bridges  | Kilgore        | Pastore      |
| Byrd     | Langer         | Smith, Maine |
| Dirksen  | Long           | Smith, N. J. |
| Douglas  | Martin         | Taft         |
| Duff     | Maybank        | Tobey        |
| Eastland | McCarthy       | Watkins      |
| Gillette | McClellan      | Wherry       |
| Green    | Monroneoy      | Wiley        |
| Hayden   | Morse          |              |

So the report was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to explain my vote of a moment ago. I notice that mine was the only Democratic vote against the conference report, so I think that that very unusual alignment calls for an explanation of the vote. I am now informed there was another.

I voted against the report to protest against and to show my disapproval of amendment No. 25. I wish to remind the Senate that we had a very difficult battle over the program of information



and educational activities, as the Senate will recall, and it was especially on the student exchange program, increasing the amount of appropriation for this over-all activity of information and exchange from \$63,000,000 to \$85,000,000, that we upset the Committee on Appropriations by a very large vote—a vote, as I remember, of 52 to 16.

However, when the bill went to conference, of course, the conferees on the part of the Senate were composed of the same Senators who had cut this program in the committee of the Senate. The conferees agreed to retain \$6,500,000, which was the amount appropriated by the House. The Senate conferees, seemingly, were unable to make any compromise whatever. Apparently they were unable to get \$1 more than the House had provided, which is a rather unusual situation to say the least. Ordinarily there is some kind of a compromise and some substantial amount is provided above or below the figure which is in controversy.

I only wish to say that I feel this is a very poor compromise, indeed, it is no compromise at all. We have lost all we had gained after a long fight on the floor of the Senate.

I should like to say another word about the exchange program. I have considered it at great length. Yesterday I had a long discussion with the head of the organization, CARE, Mr. French, who stated unequivocally that the exchange program is one of the more effective we have in combating communism. I am amazed at some of the people who profess a great interest in our international relations and who are very concerned about communism, and yet are unwilling to support this kind of program or, to any great extent, the program known as point 4. It seems to me they are taking inconsistent positions. I firmly believe that the two most effective programs the Government now has, which are both on too small a scale, are what are known as the point 4 program and the exchange of persons program. I think they are the two programs which enable the peoples of foreign nations to become acquainted with us, and to appreciate and understand what the United States is trying to do in the international picture. When we deal with governments, as we do in the ECA, which I think is necessary in Europe, I do not think we reach the people. I can well understand why the people of France and Italy have no idea of what this country has done for them, because we did not deal with them directly; we dealt with their governments.

I profoundly regret that the conference saw fit to accept this very substantial cut. I consider it a very great setback to the effort to bring about better international relations between this country and other countries of the world. It is extremely discouraging to have the conferees of the Senate give up the hard-won fruits of a long struggle in the Senate on behalf of the exchange program.

I am distressed about whether this country will ever be able to have the rest of the world understand our motives and

purposes in international relations. I cannot be very optimistic about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 4740, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.

October 11, 1951.

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 79 to the bill (H. R. 4740) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes," and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,125,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 103, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 602. No representative of the United States Government in any international organization hereafter shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget, a commitment requiring a United States appropriation of a larger proportion may be made after consultation by United States representatives in the organization or other appropriate officials of the Department of State with the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the inter-American organizations.

"No representative of the United States Government to any international organization of which the United States is not now a member shall, unless specifically authorized in an appropriation act or other law, make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget of such international organization."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 104½, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 604. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That excess factors arising from unusual requirements approved by the President may be used in applying a different ratio, but in no instance shall the number be in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 85, or a part thereof full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administra-

tion; and processing, recording, and reporting: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to personnel work concerning employees of the Foreign Service of the United States."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 107, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 606. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place two positions in grade GS-18, and seven positions in grade GS-17, in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be in lieu of any positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation previously allocated under section 505. The compensation of the Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation hereafter shall be \$17,500 per annum.

"The Secretary of State hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of Director, Office of Budget and Finance, in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

"The Secretary of Commerce hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of Director, Office of Budget and Management, in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 79, 103, 104½, and 107.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Nevada. I did not hear the number of the last amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. It was No. 107.

#### AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT TAX ACT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1347, Calendar No. 842, amending the Railroad Retirement Act, and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1347) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill S. 1347, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that of course we do not expect to dispose of this bill this afternoon; it is now too late to act on it today.

In accordance with previous announcements, if a conference report, which of











Public Law 188 - 82d Congress  
Chapter 533 - 1st Session  
H. R. 4740

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely:*

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Department of State not otherwise provided for, including expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 287o, 287q, 287r); not to exceed \$200,000 for the settlement of claims as authorized by Public Law 455, approved March 10, 1950; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance and operation of aircraft outside the continental United States; printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of uniforms; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; rental of tie lines and teletype equipment; employment of aliens, by contract, for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; establishment, maintenance, and operation of passport and despatch agencies; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; ice and drinking water for use abroad; excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; loss by exchange; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; relief, protection, and burial of American seamen, and alien seamen in foreign countries and in the United States Territories and possessions; expenses incurred in acknowledging services of officers and crews of foreign vessels and aircraft in rescuing American seamen, airmen, or citizens from shipwreck or other catastrophe abroad; rent and expenses of maintaining in Egypt, Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for American convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court, and care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U. S. C. 3192), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical information, (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids, (4) maintenance, improvement, and repair of diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries, including minor construction on Government-owned properties, (5) fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad, and (6) rental or lease, for periods

65 Stat. 575.

65 Stat. 576.

Departments of  
State, Justice,  
Commerce, and  
the Judiciary  
Appropriation  
Act, 1952.

Department of  
State Appropria-  
tion Act, 1952.

60 Stat. 999.

60 Stat. 713.

64 Stat. 12.

22 U.S.C.

§ 1621 note.

Printing and  
binding.

40 Stat. 1270.

60 Stat. 810.

Rental of tie  
lines and tele-  
type equipment.  
Refund of cer-  
tain passport  
fees.

Relief, etc., of  
American seamen.

Consular pris-  
ons, etc.

62 Stat. 825.

Advance payments  
of rentals or  
leases.



Purchase of  
foreign cur-  
rencies, etc.

Automobiles.  
63 Stat. 384.  
41 U.S.C.  
§ 231(c).  
65 Stat. 576.  
65 Stat. 577.

not exceeding ten years, of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for the use of the Foreign Service, for which payments may be made in advance; \$74,200,000, of which not to exceed \$56,079,253 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That not less than \$7,500,000 of this appropriation shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That pursuant to section 201 (c) of the Act of June 30, 1949 (41 U. S. C. 231c), passenger motor vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be exchanged or sold and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available without fiscal year limitation for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not exceed \$3,000 in the case of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission and \$1,400 in the case of all other such vehicles except station wagons.

#### REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131), \$675,000.

60 Stat. 1026.

#### ACQUISITION OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

For carrying into effect the Act of July 25, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 295b), including the initial alterations, repair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said Act, \$7,500,000, of which not to exceed \$94,500 shall be available for personal services, and which is exclusively for expenditure under the provisions of said Act which relate to payments representing the value of foreign property or credits: *Provided*, That, when specifically authorized by the Secretary of State or such Assistant Secretary as he may designate, section 6 of the Act of May 7, 1926, may be construed as including leaseholds of not less than ten years.

44 Stat. 405.  
22 U.S.C. § 297.

#### EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, to be expended pursuant to the requirement of section 291 of the Revised Statutes. (31 U. S. C. 107), \$9,900,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State may delegate to subordinate officials the authority vested in him by section 291 of the Revised Statutes pertaining to certification of expenditures.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to meet annual obligations to international organizations, the Government of Panama, and Gorgas Memorial Institute, pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific Acts of Congress, \$30,297,861: *Provided*, That the Department of State, when requested by the United Nations, is authorized to acquire surplus property for the United Nations in accordance with existing surplus property disposal laws and regulations, and the contribution of the United States to the United Nations shall be reduced by the value of the surplus property and necessary expenses, including transportation costs, incidental to the acquisition thereof.

Surplus prop-  
erty for U.N.



## MISSIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary for permanent representation to certain international organizations in which the United States participates pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific Acts of Congress, including expenses authorized by the pertinent Acts and Conventions providing for such representation; attendance at meetings of societies or associations concerned with the work of the organizations; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); purchase (not to exceed one, for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding, without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); and purchase of uniforms for guards and chauffeurs, \$1,400,000, of which not to exceed \$1,179,540 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 8 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that Act, may be applicable to the obligation and expenditure of funds in connection with United States participation in the International Civil Aviation Organization.

## INTERNATIONAL CONTINGENCIES

For necessary expenses of participation by the United States upon approval by the Secretary of State, in international activities which arise from time to time in the conduct of foreign affairs and for which specific appropriations have not been provided pursuant to treaties, conventions, or special Acts of Congress, including personal services without regard to civil-service and classification laws; salaries, expenses and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); employment of aliens; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and without regard to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949; not to exceed \$15 per diem in lieu of subsistence for persons serving without compensation in an advisory capacity while away from their homes or regular places of business; rent of quarters by contract or otherwise; hire of passenger motor vehicles; contributions for the share of the United States in expenses of international organizations; and printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); \$2,500,000, of which not to exceed a total of \$100,000 may be expended for representation allowances as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Act of August 13, 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131) and for entertainment.

## INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

For expenses necessary to enable the United States to meet its obligations under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905, 1906, 1933, and 1944 between the United States and Mexico, and to comply with the other laws applicable to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, including operation and maintenance of the Rio Grande rectification, canalization, flood control, bank protection, boundary fence, and sanitation projects; detailed plan preparation and construction (including surveys and operation and maintenance and protection during construction); Rio Grande emergency flood protection; expenditures for the purposes set forth in sections 101 through 104 of Public Law 786, approved September 13, 1950; purchase of three passenger motor vehicles for



Leasing of private property.

replacement only; purchase of planographs and lithographs; and leasing of private property to remove therefrom sand, gravel, stone, and other materials, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U. S. C. 5); as follows:

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses, regular boundary activities, including examinations, preliminary surveys, and investigations, \$900,000, of which not to exceed \$737,550 shall be available for personal services.

65 Stat. 578.

65 Stat. 579.

#### CONSTRUCTION

48 Stat. 1621.

49 Stat. 660.

55 Stat. 338.

64 Stat. 846.

22 U.S.C. 277d-1  
note.

59 Stat. 1219.

Lower Rio Grande  
flood-control  
project.

International  
Boundary and  
Water Commis-  
sion.

For detailed plan preparation and construction of projects authorized by the Convention concluded February 1, 1933, between the United States and Mexico, the Acts approved August 19, 1935, as amended (22 U. S. C. 277-277f), August 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 961), June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1463), June 28, 1941 (22 U. S. C. 277f), September 13, 1950 (Public Law 786), and the projects stipulated in the treaty between the United States and Mexico signed at Washington on February 3, 1944, \$12,000,000, of which not to exceed \$1,188,939 shall be available for personal services, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for the lower Rio Grande flood-control project for construction on any land, site, or easement in connection with this project except such as has been acquired by donation and the title thereto has been approved by the Attorney General of the United States: *Provided further*, That expenditures for the Rio Grande bank-protection project shall be subject to the provisions and conditions contained in the appropriation for said project as provided by the Act approved April 25, 1945 (59 Stat. 89): *Provided further*, That unexpended balances of appropriations for construction under the International Boundary and Water Commission available for the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with this appropriation and shall continue available until expended.

#### RIO GRANDE EMERGENCY FLOOD PROTECTION

For emergency flood-control work, including protection, reconstruction, and repair of all structures under the jurisdiction of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, threatened or damaged by floodwaters of the Rio Grande, which have heretofore been authorized and erected under the provisions of treaties between the United States and Mexico, or in pursuance of Federal laws authorizing improvements on the Rio Grande, \$30,000, to be merged with the unobligated balance of the appropriation for this purpose for the next preceding fiscal year, and to remain available until expended.

#### AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For expenses necessary to enable the President to perform the obligations of the United States pursuant to conventions between the United States and Canada signed May 26, 1930 (50 Stat. 1355) and January 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 1351), treaties between the United States and Great Britain, in respect to Canada, signed January 11, 1909 (36 Stat. 2448) and February 24, 1925 (44 Stat. 2102), the treaty between the United States and Canada signed February 27, 1950, and Convention between the United States and Costa Rica signed May 31, 1949, including stenographic reporting services by contract; hire of



passenger motor vehicles; the United States share of the expenses of the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, the International Fisheries Commission, and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, which except for the expenses of the members, may be advanced to the respective Commissions; \$702,000, of which not to exceed \$268,888 shall be available for personal services, to be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of State and to be available also for additional expenses of the American Sections, International Commissions, as hereinafter set forth:

International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, the salary of one Commissioner on the part of the United States who shall serve at the pleasure of the President (the other Commissioners to serve in that capacity without compensation therefor); salaries of clerks and other employees appointed by the Commissioners on the part of the United States with the approval solely of the Secretary of State; travel expenses and compensation of witnesses in attending hearings of the Commission at such places in the United States and Canada as the Commission or the American Commissioners shall determine to be necessary; and special and technical investigations in connection with matters falling within the Commission's jurisdiction: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized to transfer to any department or independent establishment of the Government, with the consent of the head thereof, funds from this appropriation for direct expenditure by such department or establishment for such investigations.

International Joint Commission, U.S. and Canada.  
65 Stat. 579.  
65 Stat. 580.

Transfer of funds.

International Boundary Commission, United States, Alaska, and Canada, the completion of such remaining work as may be required under the award of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal and the existing treaties between the United States and Great Britain; commutation of subsistence to employees while on field duty, not to exceed \$6 per day each (but not to exceed \$3 per day each when a member of a field party and subsisting in camp); hire of freight and passenger motor vehicles from temporary field employees; and payment for timber necessarily cut in keeping the boundary line clear.

International Boundary Commission, U.S., Alaska, and Canada.

#### INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of State to carry out international information and educational activities as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U. S. C. 1431-1479) and the Act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 501), and to administer the programs authorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1641 (b)), the Act of August 24, 1949 (20 U. S. C. 222-224), and the Act of September 29, 1950 (Public Law 861), including employment, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, of (1) persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed \$120,000), (2) aliens within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General); travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States and dependents to and from the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 801-1158); expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with activities provided for under this appropriation (not to exceed \$8,000); entertainment within the United States (not to exceed \$5,000); hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of space in

62 Stat. 6.  
53 Stat. 1290.  
60 Stat. 754;  
63 Stat. 630.  
64 Stat. 1081.  
Temporary personnel.  
Aliens.  
Investigation.  
Travel expenses.  
60 Stat. 999.  
Purchase of space in foreign publications.



20 Stat. 216.  
60 Stat. 810.  
31 U.S.C. § 529.

Experiment and demonstration stations.

65 Stat. 580.  
65 Stat. 581.

U. S. representation abroad.  
Exchange of persons.  
International short-wave radio stations.  
Indemnification of owners and operators.

Restriction on purchase of broadcasting time.

Processing and distribution of motion-picture films.

foreign language publications abroad, without regard to the provisions of law set forth in 44 U. S. C. 322; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes as amended; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries, on land acquired by gift or lease, and construction of necessary buildings thereon; radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration, script-writing, translation, and engineering services, by contract or otherwise; and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; \$85,000,000, of which not to exceed \$34,000,000 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 may be used for representation abroad: *Provided further*, That \$6,500,000 shall be available for the exchange of persons: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is authorized in making contracts for the use of the international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That in the acquisition of leasehold interests payments may be made in advance for the entire term or any part thereof: *Provided further*, That funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 per centum of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international short-wave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein shall be available for payment to private organizations abroad in pursuance of contracts entered into for the processing and distribution of motion-picture films.

#### PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION

62 Stat. 314.

63 Stat. 455.

60 Stat. 135.

62 Stat. 1225.

50 U.S.C. app.  
§ 1791(f).

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1949, \$3,000,000, to be consolidated with appropriations heretofore made under said head; and the unobligated balance of such consolidated appropriation shall remain available during the current fiscal year upon the terms and conditions specified under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1950, for expenses of liquidation of activities in the Philippines carried out pursuant to section 302 (a) of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1782, 1791 (e)), and for carrying out the purposes of section 311 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as authorized by section 3 of the Act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 882).

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Contracts in foreign countries.

SEC. 102. Contracts entered into in foreign countries involving expenditures from any of the appropriations under this title shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22).



|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>SEC. 103. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.</p> <p>SEC. 104. The exchange of funds for payment of expenses in connection with the operation of diplomatic and consular establishments abroad shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543).</p> <p>SEC. 105. Appropriations under this title available for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personal effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel, shall be available for such expenses when any part of such travel or transportation begins in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed during the current fiscal year.</p> <p>SEC. 106. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 16a of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 78 (a)), Government-owned vehicles may be used in foreign countries for transportation of United States Government employees from their residence to the office and return when public transportation facilities are unsafe or are not available: <i>Provided</i>, That each Chief of Mission shall have prior authority from the Secretary of State to approve such transportation.</p> <p>SEC. 107. During the current fiscal year and when purchases are made with foreign currencies, the Department of State is authorized to purchase for use abroad any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of busses, ambulances, and station wagons), at a cost of not to exceed the equivalent of \$2,200 for each such vehicle.</p> <p>SEC. 108. Appropriations under this title for "Salaries and expenses", "International contingencies", and "Missions to international organizations" are available for reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files.</p> <p>This title may be cited as the "Department of State Appropriation Act, 1952".</p> | <p>Termination of employment.<br/>5 U.S.C. § 652.</p> <p>Exchange of funds.<br/>65 Stat. 581.<br/>65 Stat. 582.<br/>Travel expenses.</p> <p>Use of Government-owned vehicles in foreign countries.<br/>60 Stat. 810.</p> <p>Passenger motor vehicles for use abroad.</p> <p>Security guard services.</p> <p>Citation of title.</p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice and for examination of judicial offices, including purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his Administrative Assistant; special attorneys and special assistants to the Attorney General; and examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; \$2,285,000, of which not to exceed \$2,245,000 shall be available for personal services.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                                   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <p>For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice not otherwise provided for, including miscellaneous and emergency expenses authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his Administrative Assistant; and advances of public moneys pur-</p> | <p>Advances of public moneys.</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|

Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1952.



60 Stat. 809.

suant to law (31 U. S. C. 529); \$9,032,000, of which not to exceed \$7,774,150 shall be available for personal services.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

Permanent re-  
gional offices.

65 Stat. 582.

65 Stat. 583.

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, \$3,200,000, of which not to exceed \$3,035,932 shall be available for personal services, and of which \$125,000 shall be available exclusively for activities in connection with railroad reparations cases: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be expended for the establishment and maintenance of permanent regional offices of the Antitrust Division.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS

Services in  
Alaska.

Temporary deputy  
marshals.

For necessary expenses of the offices of United States attorneys and marshals and United States district attorneys in Alaska, including purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles (one van for replacement only at not to exceed \$2,500, and one bus for replacement only at not to exceed \$15,000); services in Alaska in collecting evidence for the United States when specifically directed by the Attorney General; and firearms and ammunition; \$12,990,000, of which not to exceed \$10,415,000 shall be available for personal services, and of which not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for the employment of temporary deputy marshals in lieu of bailiffs at a rate not to exceed \$10 per day.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

64 Stat. 380.

5 U.S.C. § 341.

For expenses, mileage, and per diems of witnesses and for per diems in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law; and not to exceed \$160,000 for such compensation and expenses of witnesses (including expert witnesses) or informants pursuant to section 1 of Public Law 626, approved July 28, 1950; \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used to pay any witness more than one attendance fee for any one calendar day.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

62 Stat. 1231.

50 U.S.C. app.

§§ 1981-1987.

For expenses necessary for payment of claims of persons of Japanese ancestry, pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. 1981-1987), \$725,000, of which not to exceed \$225,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, and of which not to exceed \$219,800 shall be available for personal services.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Protection of  
the President.

For expenses necessary for the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; protection of the person of the President of the United States; acquisition, collection, classification and preservation of identification and other records and their exchange with the duly authorized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions; and such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General, including purchase (not to exceed four hundred for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of not to exceed \$10,000, for replacement only, of one armored motor vehicle; firearms and ammunition; not to exceed \$150,000 for repairs and alterations at the



Federal Bureau of Investigation Training Center, Quantico, Virginia; not to exceed \$10,000 for taxicab hire to be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in this paragraph; not to exceed \$4,500 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; payment of rewards when specifically authorized by the Attorney General for information leading to the apprehension of fugitives from justice; and not to exceed \$70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and to be accounted for solely on his certificate; \$90,000,000, of which not to exceed \$78,473,211 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That of the amount herein appropriated \$100,000 is to be held as a reserve for emergencies arising in connection with kidnapping, extortion, and bank robbery, to be released for expenditure in such amounts and at such times as the Attorney General may determine: *Provided further*, That the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be \$20,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee.

Rewards for information.

65 Stat. 583.  
65 Stat. 584.  
Reserve for certain emergencies.

Compensation of Director.

Civil-service employees.

## IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration, including advance of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while en route; payment of allowances (at a rate not in excess of \$1 per day) to aliens, while held in custody under the immigration laws, for work performed; payment of rewards for information leading to the apprehension or conviction of violators of the immigration laws; not to exceed \$35,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General and accounted for solely on his certificate; not to exceed \$5,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed one hundred and fifty for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase (not to exceed four for replacement only) and maintenance and operation of aircraft; firearms and ammunition; refunds of head tax, maintenance bills, immigration fines, and other items properly returnable, except deposits of aliens who become public charges and deposits to secure payment of fines and passage money; operation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; and maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies and their wives and dependent children, including return of such persons to place of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be authorized by the Attorney General; \$36,400,000, of which not to exceed \$30,159,900 shall be available for personal services.

Payment of allowances to aliens.  
Rewards for information.

Security guard services.  
Alien enemies.

## FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

For expenses necessary for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including not to exceed \$490,000 for departmental personal services; not to exceed \$13,500 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations

Attendance at meetings.



65 Stat. 584.  
65 Stat. 585.  
63 Stat. 167.  
Rewards for  
information.  
Acquisition of  
land.  
64 Stat. 381.  
5 U.S.C. § 341f.  
Transfer of  
funds.

concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase of not to exceed fourteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including two busses at not to exceed \$20,000 each; compilation of statistics relating to prisoners in Federal and non-Federal penal and correctional institutions; furnishing of insignia, uniforms, and other distinctive wearing apparel necessary for employees in the performance of their official duties; payment pursuant to law of claims of employees for loss, damage, or destruction of personal property (31 U. S. C. 238); firearms and ammunition; payment of rewards for the apprehension, or for information leading to the recapture, of escaped prisoners; purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock; construction of buildings at prison camps; and acquisition of land as authorized by section 7 of the Act of July 28, 1950 (Public Law 626); \$23,500,000, of which not to exceed \$15,387,450 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That there may be transferred to the Public Health Service such amounts as may be necessary, in the discretion of the Attorney General, for direct expenditure by that Service for medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions.

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

63 Stat. 461.  
U.S. Peniten-  
tiary, Leaven-  
worth, Kans.

For constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account, \$470,000, of which \$360,000 is for liquidation of authority granted under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1950, to enter into contracts for replacement of a power plant at the United States Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas: *Provided*, That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation.

#### SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For support of United States prisoners in non-Federal institutions and in the Territory of Alaska, including necessary clothing and medical aid, and payment of rewards for the apprehension, or for information leading to the recapture, of escaped prisoners; \$2,000,000, of which not to exceed \$217,200 shall be available for personal services.

#### OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

40 Stat. 411.  
50 U.S.C. app.  
§ 1.  
Administrative  
expenses.

The Attorney General, or such officer as he may designate, is hereby authorized to pay out of any funds or other property or interest vested in him or transferred to him pursuant to or with respect to the Trading with the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended (50 U. S. C. App.), necessary expenses incurred in carrying out the powers and duties conferred on the Attorney General pursuant to said Act: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,600,000 shall be available in the current fiscal year for the general administrative expenses of the Office of Alien Property, including rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia, of which not to exceed \$3,060,000 shall be available for personal services; purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this authorization: *Provided further*, That on or before November 1 of the current fiscal year, the Attorney General shall make a report to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives giving detailed information on all administrative and nonadministrative expenses incurred during the next preceding fiscal year in con-

Report to  
Congressional  
Committees.



nection with the activities of the Office of Alien Property: *Provided* further, That of the total amount herein authorized the amount of \$100,000 is to be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, general administration", Department of Justice. Transfer of funds.

### GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SEC. 202. Not to exceed \$350,000 in the aggregate from the appropriations made in this title for general administration, general legal activities, and United States attorneys and marshals shall be available, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, for compensation (not to exceed \$11,000 per annum) of special attorneys and special assistants to the Attorney General and to United States attorneys not otherwise provided for: *Provided*, That reports be submitted to the Congress on the 1st of July and January showing the names of the persons employed under the foregoing limitation, the annual rate of compensation or amount of any fee paid to each, together with a description of their duties. 65 Stat. 585.  
65 Stat. 586.  
63 Stat. 954.  
5 U.S.C. § 1071  
note.  
Reports to Congress.

SEC. 203. None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used to pay the compensation of any person hereafter employed as an attorney (except foreign counsel employed in special cases) unless such person shall be duly licensed and authorized to practice as an attorney under the laws of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia. License require-  
ment for attor-  
neys.

SEC. 204. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the offices of the United States attorney and the United States marshal for the District of Columbia from all appropriations in this title shall be reimbursed to the United States from any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia. Reimbursement  
to U. S.

SEC. 205. Appropriations and authorizations made in this title which are available for expenses of attendance at meetings shall be expended for such purposes in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General. Expenses of at-  
tendance at  
meetings.

SEC. 206. Appropriations and authorizations made in this title for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

This title may be cited as the "Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1952". 60 Stat. 810.  
Citation of  
title.

### TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary) including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem; and teletype news service (not exceeding \$1,000); \$1,484,530, of which not to exceed \$1,363,230 shall be available for personal services. Department of  
Commerce Appro-  
priation Act,  
1952.  
60 Stat. 810.

Technical and scientific services: For expenses necessary for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to business and industry as authorized by the Act of September 9, 1950 (Public Law 776), including not to exceed \$2,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$250,000, of which not to exceed \$224,280 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That moneys hereafter received by the Secretary pursuant to section 3 of said Act of September 9, 1950, for publications provided thereunder, shall be available for reimbursing any appropriation as provided by said section. 64 Stat. 823.  
15 U.S.C.  
§§ 1151-1157.  
60 Stat. 810.  
15 U.S.C. § 1153.



BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Census: For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, and publishing current census statistics provided for by law; for searching census records and supplying information with respect to age and citizenship certification; and for general administration, including enumerators at rates to be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem; \$6,500,000, of which not to exceed \$5,623,973 shall be available for personal services.

Seventeenth decennial census: For expenses necessary for taking, compiling, and publishing the seventeenth decennial census including the census of housing as authorized by law (13 U. S. C. 201-219; 42 U. S. C. 1442), including personal services at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and compensation of employees of the Department of Commerce and other departments and independent establishments of the Government who may be detailed for field work; \$7,000,000, of which not to exceed \$5,646,654 shall be available for personal services, to remain available until December 31, 1952, and to be merged with the appropriation made under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act 1951.

Censuses of business, transportation, manufactures and mineral industries: For expenses necessary to prepare for taking, compiling, and publishing the censuses of business, transportation, manufactures and mineral industries as authorized by law, including personal services by contract or otherwise at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Commerce without regard to the Classification Act of 1949; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem; and additional compensation of Federal employees temporarily detailed for field work under this appropriation; \$200,000, of which not to exceed \$147,812 shall be available for personal services, to remain available until December 31, 1953.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), the Act of August 8, 1950 (Public Law 670), and other Acts incident to the enforcement of safety regulations; maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities and air traffic control; furnishing advisory service to States and other public and private agencies in connection with the construction or improvement of airports and landing areas; and the disposal of surplus airports; including hire of aircraft (not exceeding \$395,000); the operation and maintenance of eighty-five aircraft; contract stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of expert and other witnesses; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; purchase (not to exceed twenty, for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; \$99,100,000, of which not to exceed \$74,970,000 shall be available for personal services, and the Departments of the Air Force, Army and Navy are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Administration without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, flight equipment, and hangar, line, and shop equipment surplus to the needs of such Departments: *Provided*, That

Enumerators.

63 Stat. 954.  
5 U.S.C. § 1071  
note.  
60 Stat. 810.  
65 Stat. 586.  
65 Stat. 587.

46 Stat. 21;  
63 Stat. 441.  
63 Stat. 954.  
5 U.S.C. § 1071  
note.  
60 Stat. 810.

64 Stat. 620.

63 Stat. 954.  
5 U.S.C. § 1071  
note.  
60 Stat. 810.

Operation and  
maintenance of  
aircraft.

Transfer of  
aircraft, etc.

52 Stat. 973.  
64 Stat. 417.  
49 U.S.C. § 457.



there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, and other public authorities for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of airport traffic control towers.

Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the acquisition and establishment by contract or purchase and hire of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of additional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; the acquisition of the necessary sites by lease, condemnation or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Weather Bureau stationed at remote localities not on foreign soil where such accommodations are not otherwise available; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed \$200,000 for emergency repairs and replacement of facilities damaged by fire, flood, or storm; to remain available until expended, \$22,500,000, of which not to exceed \$4,965,300 shall be available for personal services, and of which \$12,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes: *Provided*, That authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts for such purposes may be exercised until June 30, 1952, and may hereafter be accounted for under this head: *Provided further*, That the consolidated appropriation under this head for the next preceding fiscal year is hereby consolidated with and made a part of this appropriation to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund: *Provided further*, That transfers may be made from this appropriation to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration", for costs of maintenance and operation of aircraft for initial flight checking of facilities established under this appropriation (not to exceed \$325,000); for necessary expenses in connection with the transportation by air to and from and within the Territories of the United States of materials and equipment secured under this appropriation (not to exceed \$115,000); and for necessary administrative costs (not to exceed \$325,000): *Provided further*, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized during the current fiscal year to transfer without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, air-navigation and communication facilities, including appurtenances thereto, to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

65 Stat. 587.  
65 Stat. 588.

Consolidation of appropriations.

Transfer of funds.

Transfer of facilities.

Technical development and evaluation: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), relative to such developmental work and service testing as tends to the creation of improved air-navigation facilities, including landing areas, aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances, personnel, and operation methods; acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; and operation and maintenance of five aircraft, which shall be in addition to the number authorized herein under the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration"; \$1,200,000, of which not to exceed \$916,063 shall be available for personal services.

52 Stat. 973.

Maintenance and operation, Washington National Airport: For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, and protection of the Washington National Airport, including purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; not to exceed \$3,500 for the purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; \$1,300,000, of which not to exceed \$875,000 shall be available for personal services.

Washington National Airport.



Construction, Washington National Airport: For an additional amount for construction at the Washington National Airport, \$75,000, to remain available until expended.

60 Stat. 170.  
49 U.S.C. § 1101  
note.

49 U.S.C. § 1105.

65 Stat. 588.

65 Stat. 589.

Transfer of  
funds.

Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946, as amended (except section 5 (a)), to be available until June 30, 1954, \$28,700,000, of which (1) \$15,000,000 shall be for projects in the States in accordance with section 6 of said Act, (2) \$470,000 for projects in Puerto Rico, (3) \$30,000 for projects in the Virgin Islands, (4) \$300,000 for projects in the Territory of Hawaii, (5) \$200,000 for projects in the Territory of Alaska, (6) \$10,000,000 for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes and (7) \$2,700,000 shall be available as one fund for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses; including hire of passenger motor vehicles; of which \$2,700,000 not to exceed \$450,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration", to provide for necessary administrative expenses, including the maintenance and operation of aircraft, and not to exceed \$1,937,447 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the appropriation under this head for the next preceding fiscal year is hereby merged with this appropriation and the contract authorization heretofore granted for the foregoing purposes may hereafter be accounted for under this head.

62 Stat. 278.

Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory of Alaska: For expenses necessary for the maintenance, improvement, and operation of public airports in the Territory of Alaska, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 485 c-h); including arms and ammunition; \$325,000, of which not to exceed \$315,753 shall be available for personal services.

Air navigation development: For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head to enter into contracts, \$1,874,562, of which not to exceed \$75,937 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the appropriation granted under this head for the fiscal year 1951 shall remain available during the current fiscal year and may hereafter be accounted for under this head, and not to exceed \$80,000 of such appropriation shall be available for administrative expenses.

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Employment of  
temporary guards.

Transfer of air-  
craft, etc.

Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including contract stenographic reporting services; employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; salaries and traveling expenses of employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or industries serving aviation; expenses of examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; purchase (not to exceed one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; \$3,625,000, of which not to exceed \$3,354,000 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to transfer to the Civil Aeronautics Board without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, aircraft (for replacement only), aircraft engines, parts, and accessories surplus to the needs of such Departments.

#### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

61 Stat. 787.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of August 6, 1947 (33 U. S. C. 883a-883i), including purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replace-



ment only; lease of sites and the erection of temporary buildings for tide, magnetic or seismological observations; hire of aircraft; operation, maintenance, and repair of an airplane; extra compensation at not to exceed \$15 per month to each member of the crew of a vessel when assigned duties as recorder or instrument observer, and at not to exceed \$1 per day for each station to employees of other Federal agencies while making oceanographic observations or tending seismographs; not to exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); pay, allowances, gratuities, transportation of dependents and household effects, and payment of funeral expenses, as authorized by law, for not to exceed 185 commissioned officers on the active list; and pay of commissioned officers retired in accordance with law; \$12,200,000, of which not to exceed \$8,399,000 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized during the current fiscal year to transfer without reimbursement to the Coast and Geodetic Survey, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, landing craft, launches, marine engines, electronic equipment, automotive vehicles, parts, equipment, and supplies, excess to the needs of such Departments, which will serve to expedite surveys in Alaska for national defense: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, this appropriation shall be reimbursed (to the extent and in the manner required by law (44 U. S. C. 246) for charts sold to the general public) for charts published by the Coast and Geodetic Survey and furnished for the official use of the military departments of the Department of Defense.

65 Stat. 589.  
65 Stat. 590.  
60 Stat. 810.

Transfer of  
equipment, etc.

Charts; reim-  
bursement.  
28 Stat. 620.

#### BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Departmental salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce at the seat of government, including the purchase of commercial and trade reports, and not to exceed \$50,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$3,000,000, of which not to exceed \$2,641,869 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That expenses of field studies or surveys conducted by departmental personnel of the Bureau shall be payable from the amount herein appropriated.

60 Stat. 810.  
Field surveys.

Field office service: For expenses necessary to operate and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices for the collection and dissemination of information useful in the development and improvement of commerce throughout the United States and its possessions, including not to exceed \$90,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$1,953,000, of which not to exceed \$1,593,000 shall be available for personal services.

Export control: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the Export Control Act of 1949, as amended, relating to export controls, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals, \$5,388,180, of which not to exceed \$4,606,380 shall be available for personal services, and of which not to exceed \$1,277,000 may be transferred to the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, for enforcement of the export control program, and of which not to exceed \$100,000 may be transferred to the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses" under the Office of the Secretary, including not to exceed \$99,000 for personal services.

63 Stat. 7.  
50 U.S.C. app.  
§ 2021 note.  
60 Stat. 810.

Transfer of  
funds.



PATENT OFFICE

60 Stat. 810.

65 Stat. 590.

65 Stat. 591.

Multigraphing  
of headings.

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$75 per diem (not to exceed \$25,000); expenses of transporting to foreign governments publications of patents issued by the Patent Office; defense of suits instituted against the Commissioner of Patents; and other contingent expenses of the Patent Office: *Provided*, That the headings of the drawings for patented cases may be multigraphed in the Patent Office for the purpose of photolithography, \$11,500,000, of which not to exceed \$8,834,000 shall be available for personal services.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

General administrative expenses: Necessary expenses of administration, including advertising (including advertising in the city of Washington for work to be performed in areas adjacent thereto), purchase of fifty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and the maintenance and repairs of experimental highways, shall be paid, in accordance with law, from appropriations available to the Bureau of Public Roads.

42 Stat. 217.

Pan-American

Highway.

Fulfillment

of U.S. obligations.

Of the total amount available from appropriations of the Bureau of Public Roads for general administrative expenses, pursuant to the provisions of section 21 of the Act of November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 21), \$100,000 shall be available for all necessary expenses to enable the President to utilize the services of the Bureau of Public Roads in fulfilling the obligations of the United States under the Convention on the Pan-American Highway Between the United States and Other American Republics (51 Stat. 152), cooperation with several governments, members of the Pan American Union, in connection with the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway, and for performing engineering service in Pan-American countries for and upon the request of any agency or governmental corporation of the United States.

39 Stat. 355.

Federal-aid highways: For carrying out the provisions of the Act of July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented (23 U. S. C. 1-22, 24-105, 107-117), to remain available until expended, including not to exceed \$9,343,500 for personal services, \$325,000,000, which sum is composed of \$320,000,000, a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1950, and \$3,214,713 and \$1,785,287, the latter sums being for reimbursement of the sums expended for the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges which have been damaged or destroyed by floods, hurricanes, or landslides, as provided by section 4 of the Act approved June 8, 1938, and section 7 of the Act approved July 13, 1943 (23 U. S. C. 13a and 13b).

52 Stat. 634.

57 Stat. 561.

Elimination of grade crossings: For the elimination of hazards to life at railroad grade crossings, to remain available until expended, \$3,000,000, which sum is a part of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1943 by section 5 of the Act approved September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 869): *Provided*, That the amounts authorized for the elimination of grade crossing hazards by said section and apportioned to Hawaii are hereby reduced by \$188,075.

42 Stat. 218.

Forest highways: For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), to remain available until expended, \$21,000,000, which sum is composed of \$2,400,000, the remainder of the amount authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1950, and \$18,600,000, a part of the amount



authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1951, and of which not to exceed \$3,183,500 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings and sites necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such item under this authorization shall not exceed \$15,000.

65 Stat. 591.

65 Stat. 592.

64 Stat. 789.

Public Lands Highways: For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Act of September 7, 1950, \$1,125,000, to remain available until expended.

Tongass Forest Highways, Alaska: For surveys, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of Tongass forest highways in Alaska in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, \$3,500,000, of which not to exceed \$200,000 shall be available for personal services, to remain available until expended.

64 Stat. 786.

23 U.S.C. § 23

note.

Access roads: During the current fiscal year, not to exceed \$70,000 of funds remaining unexpended upon completion of access road projects authorized to be constructed under the provisions of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended by the Act of July 2, 1942 (23 U. S. C. 106), shall be available for the maintenance of roads and bridges under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Public Roads on Government-owned land in Arlington County, Virginia.

55 Stat. 766.

56 Stat. 562.

War and emergency damage, Territory of Hawaii: For the liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

61 Stat. 597.

Inter-American Highway: For necessary expenses of continuing the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, \$3,000,000, of which not to exceed \$315,900 shall be available for personal services, to remain available until expended.

64 Stat. 789.

Access roads (Act of September 7, 1950): For an additional amount for "Access roads (Act of September 7, 1950)", \$1,500,000, to remain available until expended.

64 Stat. 785.

23 U.S.C. § 3a

note.

General provisions—Bureau of Public Roads: None of the money appropriated for the work of the Bureau of Public Roads during the current fiscal year shall be paid to any State on account of any project on which convict labor shall be employed, but this provision shall not apply to labor performed by convicts on parole or probation.

Restriction on  
payments to  
States.

During the current fiscal year authorized engineering or other services in connection with the survey, construction, and maintenance, or improvement of roads may be performed for other Government agencies, cooperating foreign countries and State cooperating agencies and reimbursement for such services (which may include depreciation on engineering and road-building equipment used) shall be credited to the appropriation concerned.

Performance  
of services  
for other agen-  
cies, countries,  
etc.

During the current fiscal year appropriations for the work of the Bureau of Public Roads shall be available for expenses of warehouse maintenance and the procurement, care, and handling of supplies, materials, and equipment for distribution to projects under the supervision of the Bureau of Public Roads, or for sale or distribution to other Government activities, cooperating foreign countries and State cooperating agencies, and the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) may be reimbursed to current applicable appropriations.

Warehouse main-  
tenance, etc.

Appropriations to the Bureau of Public Roads may be used in emergency for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of employees engaged on hazardous work

Medical sup-  
plies, etc., in  
emergencies.



under that Bureau, and for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not in excess of \$100 per diem.

60 Stat. 810.

65 Stat. 592.

65 Stat. 593.

#### NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Act approved March 3, 1901, as amended (15 U. S. C. 271-278; Public Law 619, approved July 22, 1950), including not to exceed \$700,000 for improvements to buildings, grounds, and other plant facilities, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of July 21, 1950 (Public Law 618); building of temporary experimental structures; purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); as follows:

**Operation and administration:** For the general operation and administration of the Bureau; improvement and care of the grounds; plant equipment; and maintenance and protection of buildings, including repairs and alterations thereto; \$1,100,000, of which not to exceed \$490,203 shall be available for personal services.

**Research and testing:** For research, testing and other activities, as authorized by the Act of July 22, 1950 (Public Law 619), and not otherwise provided for, \$3,807,419, of which not to exceed \$3,083,228 shall be available for personal services.

**Radio propagation and standards:** For development and maintenance of primary standards of measurement of electrical quantities at radio frequencies; calibrating and certifying radio measuring instruments, apparatus, and standards in terms of the national primary standards; investigation of the phenomena affecting the propagation of radio waves; and the broadcasting of radio signals of standard frequency; \$2,735,220, of which not to exceed \$1,483,020 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year the maximum base rate of compensation for employees appointed pursuant to the Act of July 21, 1950 (Public Law 618), shall be \$6,400 per annum: *Provided further*, That the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to transfer without charge to the National Bureau of Standards materials, equipment, and supplies, surplus to their needs and necessary for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of Arctic ionosphere observation stations.

**Construction of laboratories:** For payment of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1951, \$3,800,000, to remain available until expended.

**Working capital fund:** For an additional amount for the "Working capital fund", established by the Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1950, \$2,000,000, to be available without fiscal year limitation.

#### WEATHER BUREAU

**Salaries and expenses:** For expenses necessary for the Weather Bureau, including maintenance and operation of aircraft; not to exceed \$25,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed \$10,000 for maintenance of a printing office in the City of Washington, as authorized by law; and not to exceed \$10,000 for the United States contribution to the cost of the secretariat of the International Meteorological Committee; \$25,500,000, of which not to exceed \$19,500,000 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the maximum amount authorized under section 3 (a) of the Act of June

31 Stat. 1449.

64 Stat. 371.

15 U.S.C.

§§ 272, 278a-

278c.

64 Stat. 371.

15 U.S.C. § 286.

60 Stat. 810.

64 Stat. 371.

15 U.S.C.

§§ 272, 278a-

278c.

64 Stat. 370.

15 U.S.C.

§§ 285, 286.

Transfer of  
materials, sup-  
plies, etc.

64 Stat. 629.

60 Stat. 810.

International  
Meteorological  
Committee.



2, 1948 (15 U. S. C. 327), for extra compensation to employees of other Government agencies for taking and transmitting meteorological observations, shall be \$5 per day; and the maximum base rate of pay authorized under section 3 (b) of said Act, for employees conducting meteorological investigations in the Arctic region, shall be \$5,000 per annum, except that not more than five of such employees at any one time may receive a base rate of \$7,500 per annum, and such employees may be appointed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949: *Provided further*, That such sums, as may be determined by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to be necessary, may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation to the Department of State for "Contributions to International Organizations, 1952", for contribution to the International Civil Aviation Organization for the United States share of the costs of the meteorological installation in Iceland, when said installation is transferred for operation under the "Agreement on Air Navigation Services in Iceland".

62 Stat. 286.

63 Stat. 954.

5 U.S.C. § 1071 note.

Transfer of funds.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

SEC. 302. During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations and funds available to the Department of Commerce shall be available for the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949 (Public Law 390), to the extent and in the manner prescribed by said Act.

Availability of appropriations.

63 Stat. 907.

5 U.S.C. § 596a.

SEC. 303. Appropriations of the Department of Commerce available for salaries and expenses shall be available for attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the activities for which the appropriations are made.

Attendance at meetings.

SEC. 304. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the best interests of the United States.

Termination of employment.

5 U.S.C. § 652.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1952".

Citation of title.

### TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

#### SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1952.

##### SALARIES

For the Chief Justice and eight Associate Justices, and all other officers and employees, whose compensation shall be fixed by the Court, except as otherwise provided by law, and who may be employed and assigned by the Chief Justice to any office or work of the Court, \$928,000.

##### PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

For printing and binding the advance opinions, preliminary prints, and bound reports of the Court, \$91,200.

##### MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For miscellaneous expenses to be expended as the Chief Justice may approve, \$58,350.



CARE OF THE BUILDING AND GROUNDS

For such expenditures as may be necessary to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry out the duties imposed upon him by the Act approved May 7, 1934 (40 U. S. C. 13a-13d), including improvements, maintenance, repairs, equipment, supplies, materials, and appurtenances; special clothing for workmen; and personal and other services (including temporary labor without reference to the Classification and Retirement Acts, as amended), and for snow removal by hire of men and equipment or under contract without compliance with sections 3709, as amended, and 3744 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5, 16); \$160,700, of which not to exceed \$147,500 shall be available for personal services.

48 Stat. 668.

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges, and all other officers and employees of the court, and necessary expenses of the court, including exchange of books, and traveling expenses, as may be approved by the chief judge, \$194,500, of which not to exceed \$176,715 shall be available for personal services.

CUSTOMS COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of the chief judge, eight judges, and all other officers and employees of the court, and necessary expenses of the court, including exchange of books, and traveling expenses, as may be approved by the chief judge, \$433,165, of which not to exceed \$401,165 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That traveling expenses of judges of the Customs Court shall be paid upon the written certificate of the judge.

Traveling expenses.

COURT OF CLAIMS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries of the chief judge, four associate judges, seven regular and six additional commissioners, and all other officers and employees of the court, and for other necessary expenses, including stenographic and other fees and charges necessary in the taking of testimony, and travel, \$579,800, of which not to exceed \$495,580 shall be available for personal services.

REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary repairs and improvements to the Court of Claims buildings, to be expended under the supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, \$9,100.

OTHER COURTS AND SERVICES

HAWAII

For salaries of the chief justice and two associate justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, of judges of the circuit courts in Hawaii, and of judges retired under title 28, United States Code, section 373, \$120,000.

62 Stat. 904.



## SALARIES OF JUDGES

All 65 Stat. 596.

For salaries of circuit judges; district judges (including judges of the district courts of Alaska, the Virgin Islands, the Panama Canal Zone, and Guam); and justices and judges retired or resigned under title 28, United States Code, sections 371, 372, and 373; \$5,120,000.

Retired judges.  
62 Stat. 903.

## SALARIES OF CLERKS OF COURTS

For salaries of clerks of United States courts of appeals and United States district courts, their deputies, and other assistants, \$4,520,000.

## PROBATION SYSTEM

For salaries of probation officers and their clerical assistants, as authorized by title 18, United States Code, sections 3654 and 3656, \$2,180,000: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to abridge the right of the district judges to appoint probation officers, or to make such orders as may be necessary to govern probation officers in their own courts: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any probation officer who, in the judgment of the chief or presiding judge certified to the Attorney General, fails to carry out the official orders of the Attorney General with respect to supervising or furnishing information concerning any prisoner released conditionally or on parole from any Federal penal or correctional institution.

62 Stat. 843.  
Appointment, etc.,  
of probation of-  
ficers.

Failure to carry  
out Attorney  
General's orders.

## SALARIES OF CRIERS

For salaries of criers as authorized by title 28, United States Code, sections 713 (a) and 755, \$542,300.

62 Stat. 920.

## FEES OF COMMISSIONERS

For fees of the United States commissioners and other committing magistrates acting under title 18, United States Code, section 3041, including fees and expenses of conciliation commissioners, United States courts, including the objects and subject to the conditions specified for such fees and expenses of conciliation commissioners in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1937, \$543,000.

62 Stat. 815.

49 Stat. 1327.

## FEES OF JURORS

For fees, expenses, and costs of jurors; meals and lodging for jurors in Alaska, as provided by section 193, title II, of the Act of June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 362); and compensation for jury commissioners; \$2,800,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of jury commissioners for the District of Columbia shall conform to the provisions of section 1401, title 11 of the District of Columbia Code.

Jury commis-  
sioners.

41 Stat. 558.

## MISCELLANEOUS SALARIES

For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, \$2,670,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, except that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the General Schedule grades (GS) 4, 5, 6, 7, or 8, as the appointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with that of the General Schedule grades (GS) 5, 7, 9, 11, or 12, as the appointing judge shall determine,

Secretaries and  
law clerks.

63 Stat. 954.  
5 U.S.C. § 1071  
note.



All 65 Stat. 597.

Aggregate salaries.

5 U.S.C. § 1121.

subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be final; *Provided further*, That (exclusive of step-increases corresponding with those provided for by title VII of the Classification Act of 1949 and of compensation paid for temporary assistance needed because of an emergency) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed \$9,600 per annum, except in the case of the chief judge of each circuit and the chief judge of each district court having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed \$13,050 per annum.

#### MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

39 U.S.C. § 355.

D.C. Code  
§ 21-308.

For miscellaneous expenses of the United States courts and their officers; rent in the District of Columbia; purchase of firearms and ammunition; and purchase of envelopes without regard to the Act of June 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 476); \$750,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for payment of the cost of contract statistical services for the Office of Register of Wills of the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the payment of fees to attorneys appointed in accordance with the Act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 625), not exceeding \$25 in any one case.

#### TRAVEL EXPENSES

Attendance at meetings.

For necessary traveling expenses, not otherwise provided for, incurred by the Judiciary, including traveling expenses of probation officers and their clerks, \$715,000: *Provided*, That this sum shall be available, in an amount not to exceed \$8,500, for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of Federal probation when incurred on the written authorization of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

#### SALARIES OF COURT REPORTERS

62 Stat. 921.

For salaries of court reporters for the district courts of the United States, as authorized by title 28, United States Code, section 753, \$988,200.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

For necessary expenses of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, including travel, advertising, rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and examination of estimates for appropriations in the field, \$535,000, of which not to exceed \$488,500 shall be available for personal services.

#### REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For repairs and improvements to the courthouse, including repair and maintenance of the mechanical equipment, and for labor and material and every item incident thereto, \$7,100, to be expended under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

#### REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For repairs and improvements to the United States Court of Appeals Building, including repair and maintenance of the mechanical equipment and for labor and material and every item incident thereto,



\$3,700, to be expended under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol.

#### SALARIES OF REFEREES

For salaries of referees as authorized by the Act of June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68), \$879,000 to be derived from the referees' salary fund established in pursuance of said Act. 60 Stat. 326.

#### EXPENSES OF REFEREES

For miscellaneous expenses of referees, United States courts, including the salaries of their clerical assistants, travel, purchase of envelopes without regard to the Act of June 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 476), \$1,090,000 to be derived from the referees' expense fund established in pursuance of the Act of June 28, 1946 (11 U. S. C. 68 (c) (4)), of which not to exceed \$800,010 shall be available for personal services. 39 U.S.C. § 355. 60 Stat. 327.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE JUDICIARY

SEC. 402. Sixty per centum of the expenditures for the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia from all appropriations under this title and 30 per centum of the expenditures for the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia from all appropriations under this title shall be reimbursed to the United States from any funds in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia. Reimbursement to U.S.

SEC. 403. The reports of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not be sold for a price exceeding that approved by the court and for not more than \$6.50 per volume. U.S. Court of Appeals for D.C., reports.

This title may be cited as the "Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1952". Citation of title.

#### TITLE V—FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

The following corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1952 for such corporation, except as hereinafter provided: 59 Stat. 598. 31 U.S.C. § 849.

Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated: Not to exceed \$327,000 of the funds of the Corporation shall be available for its administrative expenses, including not to exceed \$263,274 for personal services, and not to exceed \$404,000 for the expenses of vocational training of prisoners, including not to exceed \$344,796 for personal services, both amounts to be computed on an accrual basis and to be determined in accordance with the Corporation's prescribed accounting system in effect on July 1, 1946, and shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, expenditures which the said accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest. Vocational training of prisoners.



TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Persons engag-  
ing, etc., in  
strikes against  
or advocating  
overthrow of  
U.S. Govern-  
ment.

Affidavit.

Penalty clause.

Commitments for  
U.S. contribu-  
tions to inter-  
national organ-  
izations, re-  
striction.  
Consultation  
with Congres-  
sional Commit-  
tees.

Nonapplicability.

Restriction on  
appointments.

Nonapplicabil-  
ity.

SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this Act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 602. No representative of the United States Government in any international organization hereafter shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this Act: *Provided*, That in exceptional circumstances necessitating a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the budget, a commitment requiring a United States appropriation of a larger proportion may be made after consultation by United States representatives in the organization or other appropriate officials of the Department of State with the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the Inter-American organizations.

No representative of the United States Government to any international organization of which the United States is not now a member shall, unless specifically authorized in an appropriation Act or other law, make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ per centum of the budget of such international organization.

SEC. 603. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant after August 1, 1951, through the fiscal year 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

- (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;
- (b) to positions filled from within the department;

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(d) to the Department of Justice, except general administration personnel;

(e) to the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(f) to the Judiciary Branch;

(g) to the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

(h) to the operational personnel of the Weather Bureau, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Bureau of Public Roads;

(i) to the Patent Office;

(j) to the Civil Aeronautics Board;

(k) to employees under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 as amended;

(l) to employees in grades CPC-1 and 2:

60 Stat. 999.

22 U.S.C. § 801

note.

*Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel in a department subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply.

SEC. 604. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That excess factors arising from unusual requirements approved by the President may be used in applying a different ratio, but in no instance shall the number be in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to eighty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to personnel work concerning employees of the Foreign Service of the United States.

Employees engaged in personnel work, restriction.

Nonapplicability.

SEC. 605. Except for the automobiles officially assigned to the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, automobiles assigned for operation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and one-half of the chauffeur-driven automobiles in operation in the Departments on July 1, 1951, no part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government in the District of Columbia whose primary duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.

Chauffeurs.

SEC. 606. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place two positions in grade GS-18, and seven positions in grade GS-17, in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, and such positions shall be in lieu of any positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation previously allocated under section 505. The compensation of the Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation hereafter shall be \$17,500 per annum.

Grades GS-17 and GS-18.

Appointments authorized.

FBI.

63 Stat. 959.

5 U.S.C.

§§ 1105, 1071 note.

Compensation of Associate Director, FBI.



All 65 Stat. 601.  
State Department.

The Secretary of State hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of Director, Office of Budget and Finance in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

Commerce Depart-  
ment.

The Secretary of Commerce hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of Director, Office of Budget and Management in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

Short title.

SEC. 607. This Act may be cited as the "Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1952".

Approved October 22, 1951.





3540 E